

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Vol. VI. No. 2

1955

CONTENTS

JOHN BOWMAN

EARLY SAMARITAN ESCHATOLOGY

S. M. STERN

RATIONALISTS AND KABBALISTS IN
MEDIEVAL ALLEGORY

J. G. WEISS

R. ABRAHAM KALISKER'S CONCEPT OF COMMUNION WITH
GOD AND MEN

O. H. LEHMANN

GLEANINGS FROM OXFORD MANUSCRIPTS (I)

NAHUM M. SARNA and C. RABIN

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

C. RABIN, NEVILLE LASKI, and R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY

CURRENT LITERATURE

5s. 6d. net
(\$0.90)
per copy

Published Quarterly

21s. net
(\$3.50)
per annum

BY

JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS

in association with

THE SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY & THE INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES

תורה ולתעודה

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY

Hillel House, 1 Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1. Telephone : EUSton 8843

Trustees :

THE RT. HON. LORD COHEN, P.C. ; SIR BASIL HENRIQUES ; LEONARD G. MONTEFIORE ; THE MARQUESS OF READING ; RABBI HAROLD F. REINHART ; ANTHONY DE ROTHSCHILD ; MRS. MEYER SASSOON ; LEONARD STEIN.

Officers :

President and Principal : RABBI DR. LEO BAECK.

Director of Studies : RABBI DR. A. LOEWENSTAMM.

Chairman : DR. E. J. COHN. *Treasurer :* DR. O. K. RABINOWICZ.

Hon. Secretary : HUGH HARRIS.

Objects :

The Society was founded in 1947 and its objects include the following:
To encourage and co-ordinate academic research in Jewish subjects: (a) by establishing a library of wide application; (b) by commissioning scholars to research in Jewish subjects, and providing them with all such moral and practical assistance as may be possible; (c) by publishing or arranging for publication of approved works on Jewish subjects.

To establish a centre of higher Jewish learning for the general promotion of Jewish knowledge and study: (a) by providing the machinery and curriculum usual and necessary for the foundation and conduct of an academic institution; (b) by providing suitable courses of lectures and supervision in Jewish study and research; (c) by providing general lectures in Jewish subjects of wide appeal; (d) by providing periodicals and other publications.

Activities :

PUBLIC LECTURES are regularly held at Hillel House. They are given by distinguished figures in the world of Jewish learning, and the texts of same are from time to time reproduced in *The Journal of Jewish Studies*.

SEMINAR. The Monday morning Seminar is an important and distinctive feature of the Society's activities. For half the year Dr. Baeck lectures on Jewish History and Philosophy. During the remaining half of the year the Seminar is led by scholars representing varied fields of Jewish learning.

COURSES OF STUDY are arranged in Bible Exegesis, Talmud, Codes, Jewish Philosophy, and other subjects.

THE LIBRARY consists of about 6,500 volumes of Hebraica, Judaica, and related subjects.

Membership :

Annual Membership Subscription is £1 1s. 0d. New members will be most cordially welcomed. All communications should be addressed to: *The Secretary, Society for Jewish Study, Hillel House, 1, Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1.*

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



ADVISORY BOARD :

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD :

Chairman : Rabbi A. Altmann, M.A., D.Phil.
D. Diringer, M.A., D.Litt. Professor Bernard Lewis, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. C. Rabin, M.A., D.Phil. S. Stein, Ph.D. N. Wieder, Ph.D.

Vol. VI. No. 2

1955

CONTENTS

	Page
JOHN BOWMAN	
EARLY SAMARITAN ESCHATOLOGY	63
S. M. STERN	
RATIONALISTS AND KABBALISTS IN MEDIEVAL ALLEGORY	73
J. G. WEISS	
R. ABRAHAM KALISKER'S CONCEPT OF COMMUNION WITH GOD AND MEN	87
O. H. LEHMANN	
GLEANINGS FROM OXFORD MANUSCRIPTS (I)	100
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
NAHUM M. SARNA: 1. SOME INSTANCES OF THE ENCLITIC <i>-m</i> IN JOB	108
C. RABIN: 2. ON A PUZZLING PASSAGE IN THE DAMASCUS FRAGMENTS	111
C. RABIN: 3. HEBREW <i>D</i> = "HAND"	111
C. RABIN, NEVILLE LASKI, and R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY	
CURRENT LITERATURE	116

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs.

Telephone: Broughton 4027

Founded in 1953, the Institute is dedicated to the pursuit of scholarly research in the fields of Biblical and Rabbinic theology, medieval Jewish philosophy and mysticism, Jewish ethical literature, Hasidic thought, and modern Jewish philosophy. Under the hon. direction of Rabbi Dr. A. Altmann, it comprises a staff of academic experts who are engaged in both research and teaching. Post-graduates of a high standard in Hebrew knowledge are admitted as research students, and receive systematic training in all branches of Jewish religious thought.

A group of "Associates" drawn from prominent Hebrew scholars of various British universities participate in the research work planned by the Institute, and contribute to its Series of Public Lectures.

The results of the researches undertaken are published in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* and other learned periodicals. Major works are scheduled to appear in a Series of Institute Publications.

Apart from the activities mentioned, the Institute seeks also to benefit Higher Jewish Education in a wider sense. It arranges study groups for university undergraduates, lecture courses for the larger public, and it has instituted Teachers' Courses.

The programme of the Institute is worked out in consultation with an Academic Advisory Board whose members include Professors D. Daube (Oxford), B. Lewis (London), G. Vajda (Paris), J. Weingreen (Dublin), J. M. Yoffey (Bristol), Dr. D. Diringer (Cambridge), and Dr. C. Rabin (Oxford).

A limited number of bursaries is available to research students. Applications are to be addressed to the Hon. Director.

The Institute is recognised as a charitable Trust by the Inland Revenue, and contributions can be covenanted. The Governing Body of the Institute comprises prominent Jewish laymen from Manchester and London.

The Prospectus of the Institute is obtainable from the Secretary.

EARLY SAMARITAN ESCHATOLOGY

In the Samaritan Liturgy for the Day of Atonement there is the hymn *Shira Yetima*, written by Abisha ben Pinhas (d. 1376 A.D.), setting forth the fully developed doctrine of Samaritan Eschatology. The important stanzas are the fifth, describing the coming and rule of the Taheb or Samaritan Messiah, the seventh, telling of the Taheb's death and the period thereafter up to the Day of Vengeance, and the eighth, describing the Day of Vengeance and Recompense itself. About sixty years ago undue prominence was mistakenly given by Merx¹ to the fifth stanza, that dealing with the Taheb's coming and his rule. Cowley (Expositor, 1895) corrected this but perhaps stressed too much the unity of Samaritan Eschatological doctrine even before Abisha. But Abisha may have been only the systematiser. Even in Abisha's poem two separate strands, both old, are loosely interwoven.

Abisha in the fifth stanza tells of the peaceful birth of the Taheb heralded by his star. The Taheb grows in grace with God and man, is given by God a Scripture, and invested with prophetic powers. He rediscovers the Tabernacle and all its furnishings, including the Ark hidden since the period of Divine Displeasure, *Panutha*, commenced when Shilo was instituted by Eli, the first non-conformist, as the Samaritans regard him. With the proper equipment, the Priest can now make proper atonement for Israel on this, the Great Day of Atonement. As a result, the period of Divine Displeasure ends for the Samaritans, and the period of Divine Favour, *Raçon* or *Rahutha*, which Israel, and she only, had known during the Exodus period, recommences. In Jewish sources mention is made that the Tabernacle vessels will reappear in the Messianic time (Tos. Sotah 13, 1), that Elijah will restore them (Mekhil. *Beshallah* Wayassa 5, or Messiah himself [Num. R. 18]). In Enoch (liii, 6 ; xc, 28 ; xci, 13) the Messiah replaces the polluted Temple with a pure and holy one. That the Messianic time is like a second Exodus is a Jewish

¹ Ein samaritanisches Fragment über den Ta'eb oder Messias. In Actes de Huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania: II^eme partie, section i, p. 119, Leyden, 1893. Merx thought that the Gotha fragment containing the fifth stanza of the Abisha hymn represented Samaritan Eschatology *in toto*. Not knowing that Heidenheim and Hildenfeld had already published the whole Abisha hymn, he did not recognise the Gotha fragment as part of such. Though mistaken, Merx stumbled on one aspect of the truth, obscured by those who stressed the unity of the Hymn.

belief as old as the Exile. In later Jewish eschatological systems the Messianic age sometimes tends to be regarded as a renewal of creation. This is absent in Abisha's description of the time of the Taheb. There is but prosperity and political power for Israel.

Abisha tells us that "The Enemy" (unspecified) will ascend his watch-tower and, like Balaam, take up his parable: "How goodly are thy tents, O Taheb, how great his dwellings: Water shall flow from his buckets, and his strength be magnified. His king shall be higher than Gog, and his kingdom be exalted." This is virtually Num. xxiv, 5 (reading Taheb instead of Jacob), and v. 7, with some alteration, especially Gog instead of Agag. The prophecy of Balaam is fulfilled in the prosperity and political success of the time of the Taheb, at whose birth the star out of Jacob mentioned by Balaam in Num. xxiv, 17, shines in the heavens. That verse was important in Jewish Messianic expectations as well as Samaritan.² The star and Messiah became so closely identified that Akiba named his pseudo-Messiah Bar Cochba.

Jews and Gentiles alike will recognise the truth of the Taheb's teaching and as a result will *peaceably* submit to him and accept the Mosaic Law, the original of which is now in his possession; for thus we must understand the reference that the Scriptures were given to him by God. God allows him to rediscover the autograph copy of the Law. The Jews will curse Ezra for misleading them and recognise Mt. Gerizim in place of Mt. Zion. This section is like a Samaritan adaptation of Micah iv, 1-3. With a pious prayer to see the time of the Taheb the stanza on the Taheb ends.

It has been suggested by some³ that the Taheb was the origin of the Jewish Messiah ben Joseph. The question is fruitless, one might as well try to prove a Samaritan origin for a Levitical Messiah.

In stanza 7, Abisha tells how the Taheb dies in peace and is buried either with Joseph or Joshua. Abisha states that the Taheb's star is not extinguished for many years; the Tabernacle remains and there the priests offer *valid* sacrifices. All nations listen to the Law (Samaritan version) and to no other scripture. Israel prospers and increases "for many days" at least *until*, as Abisha says, "the Lord will punish them and His wrath and anger will be kindled against all nations that are in his generation, on all those

² Cf. TARGUM on Num. xxiv, cf. even PHILO, *Rewards and Punishments*, § 15, cf. also the Star of Bethlehem. Mt. II 2, 7, 9, 10.

³ E.g., NUTT: *Samaritan Targum* with Introduction, London, 1874, p. 69, note 2.

who are worshipping evil things, and he will destroy them." This withdrawal of Divine Favour because of world-wide idolatry is inexplicable if Abisha's hymn is a unity; whereas in stanza 5 (on the Taheb) all nations come to listen to the Law, in stanza 7 all nations behave like the people of the Flood (cf. Matt. xxiv, 37). I suggest we have here evidence of the suturing of two eschatological traditions. To this we shall return later. Stanza 7 ends with the reversal and overthrow of all nature, culminating in the Day of Vengeance, the Great Day. The upheavals bear resemblance to some features in Mark xiii, 24, 25; Matt. xxiv, 29, 31, but resemble more 4th Ezra vii, 42, 43, where, after the Messiah's death, there is overthrowal of everything and the world and all that is in it returns to silence of seven days followed by the Resurrection.

The eighth⁴ stanza of Abisha's hymn describes the Day of Vengeance itself. God destroys all, man and beast, grass and trees, mountains and valleys, all "saving only the everlasting hill with the Garden, which is for my future and for my rejoicing." The Garden is Eden, existing ideally around Gerizim, the everlasting hill; at present Eden is hidden. The Glory of God appears and, as God repeats (Deut. xxxii, 39): "Behold that I, I am and there is no strange God beside Me," the resurrection commences, with the earth cracking open above the dead. A pleasant odour like Myrrh arises from the graves of the righteous, who arise in their garments fresh as on the day of their burial. Moses is among the first to arise, with the light of his countenance shining like the light of the sun. On Moses returning to his body, God reveals all secrets to him and Moses immediately intercedes for Israel. God accepts Moses' prayer for the righteous in Israel, but not for transgressors of the commandments. God then quotes Deut. xxxii, 39-41. God's throne is established (cf. Dan. vii, 9) and the inquest begins with rows of Angels and the Torah examining the risen. The Patriarchs and Moses pray for the righteous Israelites, while Aaron and his sons intercede sacrificially. The righteous are passed on to the

⁴ A translation of the eighth stanza of Abisha's hymn is to be found in the late Haham Gaster's volume on Samaritan Eschatology: *Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions*, M. Gaster. Vol. I Eschatology 1932, The Search Publishing Company, pp. 96-101; see also pp. 221-77, where Gaster gives further views on the Taheb, including treatment by Pinhas (nineteenth century) of the story of the Flood as an allegory of the coming of the Taheb, cf. Mt. xxiv, 37-39. Emphasis is on repentance: the Taheb is the Penitent one *par excellence*, and he will save the few faithful by the Ark of repentance. The Taheb or Shaheb will come when sin covers the earth (cf. M. Sotah, 9, 15). The MS. of Pinhas's work is now in the Gaster Collection of the John Rylands' Library, Manchester, No. 876.

Garden, where Abisha declares great good is reserved for them, but he has been forbidden to talk of it. Sinners are burned in the fire like incense, yet Abisha conceives the Day of Vengeance as a field day for Israel. The issue is prejudged for the Gentiles. An evil smell comes from their graves, from which they emerge tattered and blackened. "They," says Abisha, "have no one to help or to speak for them, and they are ready for the burning of the fire, where they will be speedily consumed, which burneth to the depth of Sheol; Yea, the terrible fire of its burning reacheth unto the foundations of the mountains." (Cf. Deut. xxxii, 22.)

Salvation, we see, is based on observance of the Law. In this stanza no Gentile is regarded as having kept the Law. This may strengthen my hypothesis that this stanza on the Day of Vengeance comes from another source than stanza 5, that on the Taheb, where Gentiles accept the Law.

The Taheb and the Day of Vengeance have nothing to do with one another. There is no mention of him on the Day of Vengeance, nor is there mention of the Day of Vengeance in connection with the Taheb. Abisha has combined in his hymn two eschatological pictures in much the same way as in some Jewish eschatologies, the closest parallel being 4th Ezra vii, 26-43.

From Abisha's fully developed eschatological scheme we turn to the earliest Samaritan writer, Marqa, of the fourth century A.D. The fourth book of his Memar is a midrash, or rather ten midrashim, on Deut. xxxii; the seventh and the tenth are based on Deut. xxxii, 35ff. Deut. xxxii, 35, the Samaritan reads לִי וְנָקָם "for the Day of Vengeance" instead of the Massoretic Hebrew לִי נָקָם "to me belongs vengeance." The LXX and the Samaritan Targum, like the Samaritan Hebrew, read "for the Day of Vengeance." Two Jewish Targums have evidence of a conflated reading, "The Day of judgment," "The Day of the Great Judgment" in Onkelos and Jerushalmi, respectively, being added to the end of v. 34, and "to me is vengeance" being kept in v. 35. These Targumim interpret v. 35 eschatologically. Outside the LXX and the Targumim we have in Jewish works no evidence of this reading, nor of this verse being used as an eschatological proof text. Ben Sira in snubbing the Samaritans actually throws v. 28 in their teeth. The Samaritans are the people Void of Counsel mentioned in that verse. Is this because the Samaritans saw their philosophy of history and hoped for End enshrined in this very chapter, that Ben Sira takes

a verse therefrom to underline the fact that they are not Israel? But do the Targums retain something like what became the Samaritan reading of v. 35 and the eschatological interpretation of the chapter, because it was a one-time Jewish interpretation which could hardly be obliterated?

Be that as it may, the space given to Deut. xxxii by Marqa witnesses to the continual importance of that chapter, and v. 35 in particular, in Samaritan eschatology. Further, it is obvious to anyone who reads Marqa's Memar, Book IV, seventh Midrash, that Abisha ben Pinhas took the eighth stanza of his poem, that on the Day of Vengeance from Marqa's Midrash on Deut. xxxii, 35. I will not give a summary of Marqa on the Day of Vengeance as it is so like Abisha's description. Two differences there are: one is fundamental; Marqa does not preface the Day of Vengeance by an overthrowal of all creation. The other is that Moses does not intercede on the Day of Vengeance, even for Israelites, nor is Torah personified.

In the eighth verse of Abisha's hymn there is no mention of the Taheb. Likewise in the seventh Midrash of Marqa, Memar, Book IV, there is no mention of the Taheb. Yet in another Midrash by Marqa on the Day of Vengeance (Memar, Book IV, Midrash 10) mention is made of the Taheb, *but* it appears that in Marqa's view the coming of the Taheb and the Day of Vengeance are simultaneous. This may be significant, the Day of Vengeance in Marqa may not be at the end of all things, but the precursor of the Messianic age, cf. the first resurrection in the Christian Revelation of St. John. Marqa makes the coming of the Taheb a time of woe to the Gentiles and regards it as contemporaneous with the resurrection. That the Taheb as understood by Marqa is Moses, is possible. That the Taheb is not Moses, but is the prophet like Moses promised in Deut. xviii, 18, is held by modern Samaritans; some, however, so Ben-Zvi, the President of Israel and Samaritan expert, informed me, believe that the Taheb is Moses returning. It is the old question of whether Taheb means restorer or returning one. He may be both, cf. Elijah in Judaism Mal. iv, 5ff., and M. Eduyoth viii, 7, etc.

The important thing is that Marqa has little, if indeed anything, really to say of the Taheb and nothing to say of a Messianic Age before the Day of Vengeance. Marqa did not provide Abisha with the picture of the coming of the Taheb and the discovery and

setting up again of the Tabernacle and its services, for of all that Marqa says nothing. Marqa appears to make absolutely no use of Num. xxiv, 17, the Balaam prophecy appropriated by Abisha ben Pinhas or his source, for fulfilment in the Taheb.

In Abisha's poem there is no mention of Resurrection in connection with the coming of the Taheb and restoration of *Raçon* to Israel. Abisha does make clear that there is universal resurrection at the Day of Vengeance, so, too, Marqa, from whom he drew.

Abisha combined two separate eschatologies, one which told of the coming of the Taheb and the restoration of Divine Favour resulting in a sort of "millennium" in this world for those who happened to be alive; the other expected the current period of Divine Disfavour to end only after the Day of Vengeance. The Resurrection of all to punishment or recompense began the new age of *Raçon*.

Marqa believed in the Resurrection, and that was basic for his eschatology, not so for Abisha's Taheb and his golden age. By Marqa's time, the fourth century, belief in the Resurrection was presumably becoming fairly generally held in Samaritan circles, but was probably not universally held then or later.

Jewish sources from the Tannaitic to the Geonic periods claim that Samaritans did not believe in the Resurrection of the Dead. The post-Talmudic Masechta Kuthim is as emphatic about this as R. Eliezer (end of first century, beginning of the second) had been (T.B. Sanh. 90b). Epiphanius (fourth century A.D.), in his Heresies Books IX and XIV, and Leontius De Sectis VIII agree in the main with the Rabbinic indictment. Perhaps before Gesenius too much reliance was put on non-Samaritan sources for information on the Samaritans. But since Samaritan material became more available (throughout last century) the evidence of the Fathers and the Rabbis has been disregarded.

Samaritan leaders of today would like to pretend their beliefs have always been uniform and always the same. But it is not unlikely that, as Epiphanius maintained, there was one sect believing in the resurrection and three others that denied it, though even they were each and all separated from one another on other issues as well.

It is not unthinkable that Marqa, writing under the ægis of Baba Raba, the great high priest of the fourth century A.D., represents, in stressing the Resurrection, the then official view, the new

orthodoxy.⁵ But a denial of the Resurrection, or rather an ignoring of such, may well have been the once orthodox view, and did not disappear at once. By the Arab period the sects had diminished into two, and the one separating factor was whether rewards and punishments were in this world only, or in the next. The difference in opinion hinges on non-acceptance or acceptance of the Resurrection. Shahrastani,⁶ as late as the twelfth century, divided the Samaritans into two sects, the Dustaniya (Dositheans), or Al-Alfaniya, and Kushaniya. Shahrastani declares that Al-Alfan claimed he was the prophet foretold by Moses in Num. xxiv, 17, the "Star." The Alfaniya believed in rewards and punishments only in this world, whereas the Kushaniya believed in a future life and rewards and punishments in the next. The Kushaniya were the people of the truth, קושט, a favourite word for God with Marqa. Abu'l Fida of the fourteenth century refers to the Alfaniya as the Faniya, "the liars"; but Al-Alfaniya, "the millenarians," may be what they called themselves originally.

Abisha's hymn with its verse on the Taheb and those on the Day of Vengeance come from the fourteenth century, when it was necessary to revive the sorely depleted remnant of the Samaritans. Abisha's hymn, which has set the pattern for later Samaritan views on eschatology, used both Num. xxiv and Deut. xxxii as Biblical basis for eschatological doctrine. Marqa drew only on Deut. xxxii. We note that Marqa has no "millennium" in this world, or at least before the Day of Vengeance, and that the Taheb's coming and the Day of Vengeance coincide, but that the Taheb is a vague supernumerary. Abisha's view is that the Taheb comes and restores Raçon with its spiritual and very temporal benefits, and then eventually there is a new period of Panutha followed by the Day of Vengeance and resurrection and rewards and punishments in the next life. Have we here a combining of the views of the Alfaniya and the Kushaniya, and at the same time a developing of a world week. Careful study of Abisha's hymn shows that the last period of Panutha as arranged by Abisha is the sixth world period. The Day of Vengeance opens the world sabbath. But even in Judaism

⁵ The new orthodoxy introduced by Baba Raba could itself be called אִימְנוּת קִשְׁטָה cf. Tolidah (ed. NEUBAUER: *Journal Asiatique*, 1869, *Chronique Samaritaine*, p. 403). Cf. also Transcript of the original Text of *The Samaritan Chronicle Tolidah*, by DR. J. BOWMAN, University of Leeds, 1954, p. 16.

⁶ For references in Shahrastani to these sects, cf. *The Samaritans*, by J. A. MONTGOMERY, Philadelphia, 1907, p. 259.

systematisation is a mark of relative lateness ; we must remember that the Samaritans, conservative ever, lagged continually behind the Jews. It is not unlikely that this systematisation and the fusing of the two eschatological views was Abisha's work. Abisha, who inspired Abu'l Fath to write his chronicle of the Samaritans to inspire and support the Samaritans by pride in their past, doubtless attempted to co-ordinate eschatological views. Marqa's views were basic for Samaritan orthodoxy, but the old view kept alive by heretics that the hoped for time of national prosperity would be in this world, was, if combined with Marqa's promise of individual reward and punishment in a future life, invigorating nationally, just as his was more individually ; even in Marqa's eschatology, however, importance was given only to the individual as Israelite. By Abisha's time acceptance of belief in the resurrection was presumably universal and there would be no danger in absorbing a nationalist hope once associated with denial in resurrection.

Undoubtedly early Samaritan eschatology was once concerned only with a mere restoration in this world. There would be no question raised as to how long the Divine Favour would last. On these points Abisha's Taheb eschatology preserves primitive features, but originally there would be no agent but God. Belief in an agent, a Taheb, Restorer, or Returning one, would come later. The date of origin of such a belief cannot be fixed ; certainly by the first century the common people like the woman at Jacob's well⁷ expected such a figure as the Taheb who would tell us all things, including, presumably, where the Tabernacle Vessels were. And Pilate (cf. *Jos. Ant.* xviii, iv, §1) owed his recall to this brutal treatment of a mob which followed a man up Gerizim, where the man promised to discover the Tabernacle Vessels. Pilate recognised this as a messianic claim with political implications.

When at least some of the Samaritans accepted the belief in the resurrection by the time of Marqa, then the period of restoration was projected into the future world after the resurrection. Marqa presumably omits all reference to a millennium in this world as associated with denial of the resurrection. The Taheb for him is a vestigial fragment or is identified with the resurrected Moses. Marqa has preserved some very primitive features, namely, the belief in the Day of Vengeance (although now, apparently, at the

⁷ John iv, 25.

end of the world) and the fact that God and He alone acts on the Day of Vengeance.

The very name Day of Vengeance is one which proclaims the antiquity of Marqa's eschatology. Jewish rabbinic sources eschew this name. Even the Jewish Targums on Deut. xxxii, 34, 35, though with their conflated reading witnessing to an eschatological interpretation of these verses so important in Samaritan eschatology, use as we see the term Day of Judgment. The term "The Day of Vengeance" occurs but four times in the Bible, to wit, Deut. xxxii, 35 (Samaritan Reading), Isa. xxxiv, 8, Isa. lxi, 2, and Isa. lxiii, 4. There is also Jer. xlvi, 10, "a Day of Vengeance," identified in that verse with the Day of Vengeance. The Isaianic passages stand in relation to one another. Isa. xxxiv, 8 "For it is the Day of the Lord's Vengeance, the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion"; if the reference to Zion is omitted it is strikingly close to Deut. xxxii, 35 (Samaritan Reading): "Belongeth to Me Against the Day of Vengeance and recompense." In fact the Targums Ps. Jon. and Jer. had noted the resemblance between the opening verses of Deut. xxxii and Isa. xxxiv, as indeed have modern scholars. Isa. lxi, 2 "to proclaim the year of the Lord's *Raçon* and the Day of Vengeance of our God," Isa. lxiii, 4 "For the Day of Vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come" should be taken into account. The constant phrase in the Isaianic passages is "the Day of Vengeance." It appears more significant when we examine the second part of the sentences. It is interesting that the Samaritans interpreted Deut. xxxii, 35 exactly as these passages in Isaiah. The Day of Vengeance is the necessary precursor to the restoration of *Raçon* (cf. year of the Lord's *Raçon* Isa. lxi, 2). It is the Day of Vengeance on Foes when recompense is given, (cf. The year of Recompense of Isa. xxxiv, 8) and is the year of my Redemption (cf. Isa. lxiii, 4). Divine Favour *Raçon* is calculable for Samaritans by Jubilees and Isa. lxi, 1 with its mention of proclaiming liberty followed by proclaiming the acceptable year of the Lord points to the Year of Favour as the Divine Jubilee.

Whether Deut. xxxii, 35 (Samaritan Reading) be original and whether Deut. xxxii be earlier than Isa. xxxiv does not concern us here. Like Isa. xxxiv it is exilic. The points of contact of Deut. xxxii, 35 and Isa. xxxiv, 8 are patent. Isa lxi, 2 and Isa. lxiii, 4 point to such ideas in the post-exilic epoch among Jews. It is wrong to see them as Samaritan. There were no distinctively

Samaritan ideas till after the schism *ca.* 430. Incidentally, some of the imagery of Isa. xxxiv seems to find an echo in Marqa and even in Abisha's description of the Day of Vengeance.

We may say that Samaritan eschatology kept the language of some early Jewish eschatological thought, especially the "Day of Vengeance," itself connected with the old Israelitish theologoumenon, day of Yahweh, and eventually after growth of belief in the resurrection projected the Day of Vengeance to the end of time and the period of *Raçon* into the next world. But apart from *the Resurrection*, Marqa's Day of Vengeance and Recompense might be early post-exilic. In Abisha's poem traces of the belief in the period of divine favour as believed as coming in this world are to be discerned in the Age of the Taheb; but the Day of Vengeance is kept for the End and removed from integral connection with the earthly age of Divine Favour, still hoped for, and which as a result is now to be ushered in peacefully. The Taheb, the human agent of God in ushering in the earthly age of Divine Favour, has some place in Samaritan eschatology, but Samaritanism never really developed the Messianic idea, and at end of things God alone was active. Samaritanism, though projecting the Day of Vengeance forward to the end, kept the primitive idea of God alone as Deliverer of Israel. Finally, we should note that not only the beginning and the end is under the control of God, but there are no kingdoms and powers, no evil angelic powers who reign even now. God to the Samaritan is always in control even now. He does not delegate his authority—not even to a Messiah. Not in this world even is the issue ever in doubt, for God alone is King and His authority is never challenged.

JOHN BOWMAN.

Leeds.

RATIONALISTS AND KABBALISTS IN MEDIEVAL ALLEGORY

The small town of Guadalajara is the second stop for fast trains—or what are called fast trains in Spain—on the railway line from Madrid to Saragossa. It is not an important place, and no centre for tourism. I hardly think that many travellers would break their journey to have a look at it—especially since the town's only monument of outstanding architectural merit likely to attract sight-seers, namely, the palace of the Dukes of El Infantado, was almost completely destroyed in the Spanish Civil War. Yet when my train stopped at the station, and I read the inscription Guadalajara, my imagination was curiously touched. I must confess, however, that I did not actually get out of the train, and had I decided to do so and pay the town a visit, I should no doubt have been disappointed, as there is hardly anything there in the way of material objects on which one's imagination could lay hold. But the name Guadalajara conjured up many memories of the Jewish past in Spain.

When the Arab general, Tarik, on his conquering march through Spain in 711, took Guadalajara, he found there Jews whom he charged with the defence of the town in view of possible attempts by the Christians to reconquer it. From about 1100, a few years after Guadalajara had been taken back from the Muslims by the Castilians, we have a curious record of the visit of Rabbi Joseph ibn Ferrusiel, a courtier of Alfonso VII of Castile, and nicknamed Cidello, "the little Master." Judah Halevi, the great poet, composed a Hebrew ode in strophes for the occasion, and added to it, in the fashion of these strophic poems, a Spanish tail-piece. The last strophe introducing the Spanish lines reads: "Sweet aromas sweep through the River of Stones,¹ the glad tidings of the Prince, who nurses the people of God with delights. 'Long live the Prince!' they say, 'Amen!' and they sing"—then follow the Spanish lines—"*Descuand meu Cidello venid, tan bona'l-bishara, Como rayo de sol exid, en Wadi'l-Hijara.*" "When our little Master comes, how good are the tidings! It is like the rays of the sun shining over

¹ This is the translation of the name of Guadalajara, which is of Arabic origin: Wadi'l-Hijara, River of Stones.

Guadalajara." King Alfonso, in granting privileges to the town in 1139, also defined the rights of the Jews. The community reached its highest point, both in numbers and in importance, during the thirteenth century. In 1391 it was heavily affected by the persecutions of those black years, and like the Jewish communities in the whole of Castile, it never wholly recovered. In 1476 the Jewish population of Guadalajara paid only one-third of the usual taxes—a sign of their decline. In 1481 a Hebrew printing-press was established in the town, and some of the books printed there are still extant. The end came in 1492, the year of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain.²

The greatest claim Guadalajara can make on our interest is, however, to have been the home of Rabbi Moses de Leon, the author of the *Zohar*. Rabbi Moses was born in Leon about 1240, but lived for the greater part of his life in Guadalajara, and it was in that town that he wrote the *Zohar*. At that time there also lived in Guadalajara another scholar, evidently a friend of Moses de Leon—namely, Rabbi Isaac ben Solomon Ibn Abi Sahula, with whose book of fables this paper will deal.

Rabbi Isaac Ibn Abi Sahula was born in 1244. In his youth he was a pupil of the important Kabbalist Rabbi Moses of Burgos, and his commentary on the Song of Songs, dated 1283, is, as Professor Scholem has shown,³ full of Kabbalistic interpretations which he attributes to his master. His book of fables, *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni*, was written in 1281, two years before the commentary on the Song of Songs. A passage in the introduction may indicate that he was away from his home at that date. We also owe to Professor Scholem the discovery which links this work of Isaac Ibn Abi Sahula with Moses de Leon and the *Zohar*. He says⁴: "The oldest quotation from the *Zohar* dates from the year 1281, and is to be found at the end of the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni* by Isaac Ibn Abi Sahula. It is a passage from the *Midrash Ha-Ne'elam* (concerning cosmography, namely, the varying length of the day in various latitudes and similar questions). The author, who, like Moses de Leon, lived in Guadalajara, two years later wrote a mystical commentary to the Song of Songs. He does not there quote the full text of the passages from the genuine Midrashim to which

² For the Jews in Guadalajara, see *Encyclopædia Judaica*, s.v.

³ *Kiryat Sefer*, Jerusalem, 1929-30, p. 109ff.

⁴ *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York, 1941, p. 187.

he alludes, but he does make use of a good number of quotations from an obviously unknown and unpublished Midrash—none other than the *Midrash Ha-Ne'elam* to the first three *Sidras* of the Torah." This was incidentally one of the facts which allowed Professor Scholem to draw the conclusion that the *Midrash Ha-Ne'elam* was the earliest part of the *Zohar*, the forerunner of the *Zohar* proper, and was written between 1275 and 1280, probably not long before the latter year, while the bulk of the work was completed in the years 1280-86. It seems that Professor Scholem has lately found another quotation from the *Zohar* in the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni*.

We see then the intimate relation that must have existed between the two men. Isaac was given access to the *Midrash Ha-Ne'elam* long before Moses de Leon started circulating copies of his pseudepigraphic writings. In effect, Isaac must have belonged to the inner circle of Moses de Leon's friends.

The question arises whether the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni* shows anything about its author's religious views, or whether it is simply a straightforward book of fables, with no further relevance for the history of Judaism and the Kabbala beyond containing those quotations from the *Zohar*, and thus helping to shed light on the literary problems of that great book. It is obvious that if the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni* has a definite religious tendency, the book would acquire a great importance, as it would teach us something about the ideas current in the environment which gave birth to the *Zohar*.

The few scholars who have mentioned, usually rather *en passant*, the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni*⁵ never seem to have discerned in it more than a book of fables, and as such they judged it rather severely. It cannot be denied that there is some justification for such unfavourable criticism of it as a book of fables. Most of the fables do not show very rich invention as far as their plots are concerned, nor does the book contain even a representative collection of famous stories in Hebrew garb, as it was deliberately intended to be something different from the well-known books of fables of foreign literature. There are a few witty anecdotes, and the author has a nice sense of humour, for example, in putting Talmudic arguments in the mouth of his animals. He very often writes in a lively and witty style, but it is also true that he is often boring, as, for example, in the lengthy passages where he sets forth largely irrelevant and

⁵ For the book in general, see M. STEINSCHNEIDER, *Librorum Hebræorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana Catalogus*, No. 5415.

prosy dissertations on sundry scientific subjects. However, the book is only partly meant to be a work of entertainment. It is true that Ibn Abi Sahula professes in his introduction to have written his book with the aim of providing a substitute for the foreign books of fables which provided entertainment for the Jewish readers. Instead, he wanted to furnish them with light reading which should at the same time be full of words of the Torah—"secular things with sacred purity."⁶ Though this self-testimony cannot be quoted in support of the view that the book has a special contemporary tendency, it cannot be quoted against it either. It is no use arguing that if the author had had such aims in mind, he would have alluded to them more explicitly; although authors' prefaces usually say the truth, they do not always say the whole truth. One should question the book itself, not the preface; and I shall try to show that this has a spiritual message.

One word about an aspect which it is not intended to cover here. Mention has been made of the lengthy scientific digressions of which the book is full, and this fact is quite interesting in itself. There is no doubt that this Kabbalist had received a good scientific education—as Moses de Leon had, too, by the way. Moreover, he kept a lively interest in these matters, and in inserting such topics in his book he pursued the didactic aim of giving his readers elementary lessons on science and philosophy. Here there is certainly something beyond mere entertainment—yet it is not such general didactic tendencies which I have in mind, but rather the purpose to advance the cause of his side, the Kabbalistic side, in the contemporary battle of ideas. (To be sure, also in his scientific excursus he often gives the topic under discussion a religious turn—but that is another story.) Read in this new light, many a passage which otherwise seems tedious assumes new significance and new life.

Before entering into a discussion of the specific passages that to my mind have such a tendency, a few words are needed about the framework of the book. The author represents himself as having gone outside the town, in the year 1281, full of thoughts of repentance. He meets Goliath the Philistine and four assistants, who try to make him desist from his pious intentions. Each of the five *advocati diaboli* tells a story, the moral of which is an attack on a

⁶ Fol. 2v. Quotations are from the Venice edition, ca. 1545-50, printed by Meir ben Jacob Parenzio.

certain good quality. The author retorts with a story to the contrary. The following are the subjects discussed, each occupying a chapter: Wisdom, Repentance, Good Advice, Modesty, and Fear of God.

We shall now consider the particular tendencies of the author, starting with his polemics against the men of the world. Thanks to the profound book of Professor Baer on the history of the Jews in Christian Spain,⁷ we know that one of the main problems in the internal life of Spanish Judaism in the thirteenth century was the position of the Jewish aristocracy. The contrast between the rich Jewish financial administrators, having close relations with the courts of kings, and very often steeped in rationalistic philosophical culture, and the other sections of the community, is one of the main themes of the Jewish history of the century. It is against this social background that the growth of mysticism in Spain is to be envisaged. The Kabbalist stood in the vanguard of the fight against the Jewish courtly society and for a reform in the life of the Jewish community. Several passages in Ibn Abi Sahula's book can only be understood, it seems, as polemics against the class of Jewish courtiers who used their power to oppress the weaker members of the community. The most revealing story in this connection is the following⁸:

There was in the land of Havila a proud falcon; he was great in size, fine-looking, and overbearing. He had never learned good behaviour, as his father had spoilt him. He oppressed "the sons of his people," overthrowing morals and committing sins. He had two highly respected neighbours, the cock and the partridge. The cock was a man of his word, old and honoured, and fearing God. The partridge was humble and modest, closing his eyes lest he should see oppression and shedding of blood, a very pupil of Abraham. The cock decided to talk to the violent falcon and admonish him. One day the falcon went hunting in the midst of the community and killed some pigeons. When he went home, the cock came after him to reproach him for his tyranny and to invite him to repentance. "I have a word of God for you, my lord: you are involved in strife and violent contentions; I feel it is my duty to protest. As the prophet has said: 'If thou warn the wicked and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul.' Brother, be

⁷ Y. BAER, *Toledoth Ha-Yehudim Bi-Sefarad Ha-Notserith*, Tel Aviv, 1945.

⁸ Fol. 19v., ff.

humble, like the ascetic in the story." (We shall omit the story for the present, but shall consider it separately later.) The falcon answered the cock in an impertinent manner, and finally ejected him by force.

Next, the falcon caught some young storks. The whole community ran in terror to the house of the partridge, the other pious neighbour of the rapacious tyrant. Though the cock tells them of his unsuccessful attempt, it is decided to try persuasion once more. When the partridge approaches the falcon, he is furious: "Who are you, partridge, but a miserable beggar? How dare you speak to me thus!"—and his only reaction is to snatch away two little turtle doves standing next to the partridge. The birds dejectedly discuss their failure. It is the cock who finds the way out: "Our master the *gaon* with the long wings, the Great Eagle, he it is who does justice to the oppressed—he will know how to deal with the falcon." So they send envoys to the eagle to complain. The eagle asks if they have witnesses; when he hears that they have, he sends his servant the vulture to arrest the falcon. The trial is conducted according to all the Rabbinical rules of procedure. The eagle sits in judgment, with his assessors around him. First, possible mitigating circumstances are explored. Then the falcon is brought in, as a prisoner may not be condemned *in absentia*. The cock and the partridge state in evidence that the falcon did commit his murders after he had received the warning without which no murderer is liable to the death penalty. The court cross-examines them, as prescribed by Talmudic procedure. Next day judgment is given, the falcon is sentenced to death, and is duly hanged.

Clearly, the whole point of the story lies in its describing the contemporary state of affairs. The falcon is the type of the high-handed aristocrats, like those "violent treasurers" mentioned in the contemporary sources. There is no need to give details, as this type has been fully described in Professor Baer's book.⁹ Moreover, one is especially struck by the rôle of the eagle. He is described as a rabbi of wide authority, who knows how to deal with the high and mighty. As a matter of fact, we know very well that the rabbinical courts of the period dealt with criminal cases. Rich material from the end of the thirteenth century on this subject is available in the responsa of Rabbi Solomon ben Adret. Although on the

⁹ Chap. iii, p. 78ff., especially paragraph 4, p. 127ff.

whole averse to death sentences, he did write in one of his responsa (dated 1281, the very year of the composition of our book) concerning the administration of the community: "One should start with mild words, but if they do not help, take a stick and smite them on the head."¹⁰ It is not suggested that the story reflects an event which actually took place, although, to be sure, in 1280 R. Solomon b. Adret and R. Jonah Gerondi sentenced a young man belonging to the Jewish aristocracy (he was a nephew of one of the most important Jews of Barcelona, Benveniste de Porta) to death for denouncing a Jew to the authorities. In that case, however, the situation was somewhat different, for it was the king, Don Pedro III—a monarch who sincerely tried to improve the situation of the Jews of his realm—who insisted that the man should be punished, and it was only after he had threatened the reluctant Rabbis with prison that they did deal with the case before their tribunal. Also, it was the king's justice which carried out the death sentence imposed by the Rabbinical court.¹¹ In spite of the differences, we see that the case envisaged in the story was not so far from reality as one would imagine. While it hardly describes an actual fact, it does represent a piece of propaganda against the tyrannical aristocrats: it is thus that they should be dealt with.

This picture of the contrast between the man of the world and the pious can be filled in with characteristic details from other stories. There is, for example, the short anecdote of the hart and the goat.¹² The hart was humble, meditative, prayerful, constantly repenting, continent in his food and his love; the goat was proud, vicious, and indulging in sexual pleasures. The goat was afraid lest the pious hart should influence his children, so he endeavoured to persuade him instead to leave his righteous ways. He cynically told the story of the wife of the pious penitent who enjoyed herself with a worthless youth while her husband spent his nights in prayer; at the end she ran away with her lover, taking all her husband's belongings with her. The moral is, in the husband's words: "Penitents, leave your ways, choose the path of impertinence and wantonness, lest what has befallen me befall you!" The goat echoes these sentiments for the benefit of the hart: "Enjoy yourself, young man, in your youth! Up man, of woman

¹⁰ BAER, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

¹¹ BAER, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-7.

¹² Fol. 15v., ff.

born, rouse your desires, put on the cloak of pride. Rise and be like the children of this world, whose ways are indeed pleasant!" The hart answered that the story of the penitent's wife made no impression on him, as he knew very well that women are an affliction. A righteous man will pay no attention to their tortuous ways, and is patient in adversity. Saying this, he returned to his sack-cloth and his fasting, asking God that He should take him from this world. In effect, he was soon slaughtered by the shepherd. The goat points out that this is the end of the pious. This is, of course, a story told by the *advocatus diaboli*, but in all such cases the author intends us to be repelled by the wickedness of the story.

A characteristic feature in the description of the man of the world is his pride in his lineage. In the chapter on "modesty" we find the description of two neighbours: the dove and the raven.¹³ The dove was modest; the raven "was very much concerned with his pedigree, and haughty on account of his distinguished ancestors." The dove tried to enter into conversation with him, but the answer he received was: "A man must be proud of his pedigree and haughty on account of the rank of his ancestors and family; he must vaunt his wisdom and knowledge, and have the world admire his intelligence."

In a long story in chapter one¹⁴ we find the fox boasting in the court of the lion: "I am the clever fox, son of such-and-such the Great Fox, etc.—all my ancestors were servants of kings, all honoured according to their lineage and worth." Another personage of the story, the hart, was humble, honouring the learned, sitting in the dust of their feet and drinking with thirst their words. His father was a great scholar who had written a book on logic. This provides an excuse for the hart to deliver a long lecture on the division of science and on psychology—a characteristic way for Ibn Abi Sahula to drag in a discourse on science. In the course of this philosophical dissertation the hart describes the fate of the souls of the wicked.¹⁵ Among those having no share in the future life he mentions—in addition to heretics and unbelievers, those who deny the Torah, the resurrection and the coming of the Messiah, and the apostates—also "those who cause the multitude to sin, like Jeroboam, who contravene the decisions of the community, the

¹³ Fol. 40r., ff.

¹⁴ Fol. 9r.

¹⁵ Fol. 10r.

rebellious who sin unashamedly, the denouncers, slanderers, those who do not practise circumcision, men of bloodshed, leaders who terrorise the community for selfish purposes, and accept bribes from the butchers and milkmen." It seems obvious that contemporary characters are envisaged.

We turn now to the other side of the picture: to the ideal of the author. It is the reverse of the unrepentant man of violence, namely, the ascetic. His nature is described in one of the most characteristic stories of the book, the one which was told by the cock in the tale discussed earlier. It is the story of a man "who has returned to God with all his heart, soul, and mind," and describes an ascetic and preacher in detail.¹⁶

Hebher Ha-Ahohi, son of Bildad Ha-Shuhi, lived in the land of Teman. In his youth he did not study, was insolent towards his parents, and kept bad company. His father expelled him from his house and he became a highwayman. On the road one day, he met an ascetic and intended to rob him. He soon found out, however, that the saintly man carried nothing on his person. He started to abuse him for being such unprofitable quarry, at which the ascetic said: "If you will let me alone, I promise to reward you richly." The robber said: "So you do have treasures—tell me how you came by them." The ascetic told the robber his story, which was as follows: He had been a successful merchant and acquired much gold and silver. His heart despised the Creator of the light and dawn, because of the multitude of his possessions. His bad inclinations gained the upper hand over his pure soul, and he went in pursuit of pride to the "Graveyard of Desire."¹⁷ He was, however, afflicted by a severe illness. The doctors could not help him, until he found a physician who explained to him that the condition of cure was previous repentance. He made a vow to become an ascetic if he recovered his health—and so it happened. He was cured and fulfilled his vow. He built a house for devotion outside the town, assembled in it several companions and disciples to whom he taught the Torah, and endowed his money to succour the poor and redeem prisoners. Lately he had heard that a Jew was imprisoned by the Gentiles, and he told the robber, Hebher Ha-Ahohi, that he was just on his way back after having redeemed the prisoner. He "talked to the heart" of the robber to persuade

¹⁶ Fol. 20r., ff.

¹⁷ Heb. Kibhroth ha-Ta'awah. Numbers xi, 34.

him to come with him to his house. Hebher was persuaded and went with the ascetic to the "house of assembly." The ascetic greeted his disciples and asked about their studies. The disciples said that they could not solve a difficulty concerning a famous passage on the various kinds of atonement (*b. Yoma* 86a). The ascetic settled the difficulty. The robber was deeply touched and lamented his youth, which was spent in sin instead of Torah. "He had not finished his meditations about the greatness of his sins and the evil of his offences, when a 'silent voice' came to bring him tidings and made his hair stand on end: 'Turn back, wayward children, far and near; I do not desire the death of the wicked in shame and guilt; I am merciful, saith the Lord, and do not persist in my anger forever.'" The man cried out in terror on hearing the voice, but the ascetic reassured him. Referring to those "kinds of atonement," he explained each of them in turn: alms; the change of name; the change of deeds; and the change of place. He laid especial stress on the last, giving a personal interpretation of it: "The way of most people is to be influenced by, and follow the habit of, the place in which they are living. For this reason a man must keep to the company of wise men. If he lives in a place where the inhabitants are wayward, and the chiefs are robbers, he must waken his soul by speaking to it thus: 'These people are harming the righteous and are not supporting the learned; they choose fools for their chiefs and judges, so that insolent boasters have the power to render judgment. Now my soul, let us go in the light of our God to a place of righteous men, who hold fast to the Torah; let us attach ourselves to them by all possible means.'" If he cannot leave because of ill-health, or because there is a war, he should sit in solitude and examine his deeds, he should dwell alone and be silent. If people do not let him alone, he should go to desert places, in the mountains or valleys, and spend his time in humility and the contemplation of God's deeds. So he will see God. "These are," ended the ascetic, "the main rules of penitence; the most important being study." Hebher made up his mind to remain with the ascetic; the ascetic cared for his upkeep, and even gave him money to repay the victims of his former career as a highwayman. Hebher studied the Torah with commentaries and devoted himself also to studying Talmud and Agada, Sifre, Sifra, and Tosefta. The ascetic gave him his daughter in marriage and quoted: "Let a man sell all that he has in order to marry his

daughter to a scholar, but one who marries her to an ignorant man is as though he casts her bound before a lion." When the people of the city near by heard of the fame of the house of assembly, they invited him to come to their city and establish his dwelling there, so as to serve as an example for its inhabitants. The ascetic asked to be excused because of his age, proposing in his stead his son-in-law, the former robber. The latter was reluctant to leave the ascetic, but the ascetic told him that he ought to go, to guide them in the right way; moreover, he could, whenever he wished, visit him in his retreat outside the town. The man agreed, went to the town and led the townspeople in the path of study and practice, and "taught them the law of repentance as it is written in the *Sefer Ha-Yashar*." (One would like to know whether this is merely a rhetorical phrase or a direct allusion to the well-known pseudo-Rabbenu Tam.^{17a}) "From time to time he went to visit his master, on New Moons, Sabbaths, and Festivals. It was his habit to go once a week to the market to supervise the correctness of weights and measures."

It would again be an exaggeration to affirm that every detail in this story is taken from real life. For example, the idea that if a man finds no town congenial to study and pious life he must seek solitude is taken from a literary source, viz., the Code of Maimonides. Nevertheless, it seems that one may confidently regard the story as the exposition of the author's ideal, more or less put into practice by the circles to which he belonged. The idea of repentance is held by the author to be of great importance, and we have already seen several passages where he dwells upon this subject. Very significant is the picture of a spiritual guide invited by the inhabitants of a town. It may not be beside the point to recall again in this connection the great movement of reform and repentance which took place in the community of Toledo in 1280, one year before the date of the book. The curious detail of the special care taken to ensure just weights also corresponds to the demands of the contemporary writers on morals; the advice to appoint supervisors over the market for the very purpose is given by writers such as R. Jonah Gerondi and R. Todros b. Joseph Abulafia.¹⁸

^{17a} ENELOW, *Menorah Hamaor* iii, Introd. p. 24, seems to take this for granted, but without adducing any evidence.

¹⁸ BAER., *op. cit.*, pp. 168, 171, 344 (note 60).

Having examined the author's ideas on questions of social order—his stand against the men of the world and his ideal of the pious repentant—let us consider another of his favourite themes, one of a more theoretical nature, namely, his stress on Divine Providence and his polemics against astrology.

The idea of the world being ruled by divine providence is very dear to Isaac Ibn Abi Sahula, and he mentions it again and again. In the story of the falcon the pious cock tells the no-less-pious partridge: "You have told me words of intelligence, the actual truth: that no help arrives and no affair prospers save by the providence of the Most High in heaven." Or another passage in the same story: "The only correct belief is that nothing comes into effect except by well-planned intention from above." It must be pointed out that the idea of providence occupies an important place also in the *Zohar*, coupled with violent polemics against the rationalists, "the fools who ignorantly pass by wisdom, who say that the world runs without God's providence."¹⁹ Curiously enough, while the polemics of the *Zohar* turn against those who substitute the laws of nature for providence, Isaac Ibn Abi Sahula does not mention these, but turns against rationalists of another kind: the believers in astrology. It need hardly be said that astrology, nowadays considered a superstition, constituted in the Middle Ages a valid part of science. To be sure, not all philosophers believed in it—it is enough to recall that Maimonides was a contemptuous adversary of astrology. But other philosophers did believe in the influence of the stars; the astrological works of Abraham ibn Ezra, for example, were among the classical works of that science. In effect, astrology aimed at reducing the order of events in the world to mathematical laws, and it is just at that point that it came into conflict with the belief in a world governed by God's will.

The whole of the fifth chapter of the book is devoted to a discussion of astrology. The advocate of that art tells the following story to support his belief in it²⁰: There was once a stork who was eating the frogs of the lake. One of the frogs hid himself. The stork came to his door and tried to persuade him to come out. "Fate calls every creature and catches every living being when its turn arrives. Fate carries out the pre-ordained decree and no devices or hiding-places are of avail." The frog contests this and tries to prove

¹⁹ Quoted by BAER, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

²⁰ Fol. 49r., ff.

the opposite by arguments from the Bible: the command to make a parapet on the roof, lest one should fall; the verse "Beware of all evil things," prove the wrongness of fatalism: "If fate is true, human efforts are false."²¹ The stork answers the frog by repeating his fatalistic conviction. Man cannot escape by his deeds from his fate. The stars issue absolute orders over the earth, which are carried out at the appointed time. The frog rejoins that it is neither the way of faith nor of reason to rely on the forecasts of the astrologer. Those who know keep away from the astrologers' foolish words and laugh at them. God does as He wills. The stork appeals to authority: "How can you speak thus, since the wise men of old compiled books on the science of the stars"—and he goes on to give a lesson in astrology. The frog replies that all that talk is nonsense, as all the stars are in the hand of God. It is He who looks down upon men from His heaven and gives them their sustenance, and provides and cares for the inhabitants of the earth. The stork thereupon produced a crushing proof: he took an astrolabe, made calculations, and at a time when the constellations were against the frog, caught him.

The arguments of the advocate of astrology are rejected with scorn by the author.²² "All you say is sheer foolishness, derived from the Chaldeans. The astrologers simply invent these things and find credit with the unbelievers; we, however, have heard: 'You shall not use enchantment, nor practise augury!'" He tells the story of the unicorn and the gazelle, which is full of reflections on fatalism, free will, and astrology. The following sentence represents the spirit prevailing in the story: When the unicorn, on the approach of the hunters, does not wish to flee, as it would be useless, he says, to fight against fate, the gazelle replies²³: "Free choice is given to man, so that he should not deliver himself into the hands of chance . . . and should pay no heed to the foolish and lying words of the astrologers who say that all man's destinies are fixed at the time of his birth, and nothing avails against his luck; and that his life has a fixed limit, established at the time of his birth; nobody pious or wicked can escape. All these are lies. I have not seen the righteous abandoned, for God shelters him at the time of his

²¹ This is a well-known saying in Arabic literature which entered Hebrew literature through the translations of Arabic collections of sayings, like the *Mibhar ha-Peninim*.

²² Fol. 54r., ff.

²³ Fol. 55r.

distress . . . therefore, one must take precautions against chance."

In this paper an attempt has been made to give an account of the social and religious tendencies of the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni*, as far as they may be discerned. Though these tendencies do not seem to have struck the literary historians who have read the book, they are, one feels, nonetheless there, and the book cannot be explained simply as a mere book of fables, or simply as a Judaised book of fables. It is my hope that the interpretation I have given to the stories will find approval with those who are experts in the history of the period. I should stress that my own knowledge of the contemporary religious literature, and especially Kabbalistic literature, is both scanty and mostly second-hand. The observations I have ventured to offer occurred to me when I read the *Meshal Ha-Kadmoni*, almost ten years ago, as a piece of literature, not expecting to find anything different from the ordinary Hebrew collections of stories in which I was then interested. I only hope that my rashness will be judged charitably. If my interpretation is approved by those in a position to judge, the book of Isaac Ibn Abi Sahula will assume a great importance as a document of the social tendencies that prevailed in the circle of the author of the *Zohar*, and of the propaganda disseminated by this circle for the benefit of a wider public not initiated into the technicalities of Kabbalah.

S. M. STERN.

Oxford.

R. ABRAHAM KALISKER'S CONCEPT OF COMMUNION WITH GOD AND MEN

The figure of R. Abraham Kalisker (d. 1810) emerges in Hasidic tradition as that of a revivalist *enfant terrible* whose wild behaviour scandalised practically everybody and evoked revulsion and anger even among Hasidim, to say nothing of their opponents, the Mithnaggedim. According to R. Shneur Zalman of Ladi, the Maggid of Mezritch rebuked his disciple R. Abraham in the strongest terms for his and his followers' conduct.¹ Hasidic tradition speaks of the "Talk Hasidim," the group connected with R. Abraham, as a kind of religious anarchists.²

Very little is known of his teaching. He wrote no book, neither were his homilies noted down and collected by disciples. Some sayings of his appear at the end of *Sefer Hesed L'Avraham*,³ but these contain little that is new or of interest to the student of the doctrinal history of Hasidism. In many respects, e.g., in his emphasis on *emunah* (faith), he is evidently under the influence of his elder friend to whom, in a letter, he refers as his master, viz., R. Menahem Mendel of Vitebsk.

The letters, however, written by R. Abraham from Palestine, whither he had emigrated (1777), together with R. Menahem Mendel, are full of interest in many respects. During the latter's life-time, R. Abraham would add only a few lines to R. Menahem's long letters. When he died (1788), R. Abraham himself wrote long epistles containing much information concerning the life of the small Hasidic community and its relations with those around it. The epistles abound with unceasing complaints of the high and ever-rising cost of living.

Fortunately these letters comprise not only historical but also doctrinal material which both in content and literary form surpass what is otherwise extant of his teaching and homilies. Moreover, here we do not have second-hand notes made by some clumsy-

¹ Cf. S. DUBNOW, *Toledoth ha-Hasiduth*, Tel Aviv, 1930, vol. I, pp. 112-3; G. G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, London, 1955³, pp. 334-5.

² M. WILENSKY, in *Kiryath Sefer* i, 1926, p. 240; W. RABINOWITSCH, *Der Karliner Chassidismus*, Tel Aviv, 1935, p. 33.

³ ס' חסד לאברהם פי שנים בדרושים על התורה, רמח"ד, ר' אברהם דמלאך, . . . והשני . . . מו"ה אברהם קאליסקער [Cernovitz] תר"א.

handed disciple, but authentic letters of R. Abraham himself, although most probably these (like R. Menahem Mendel's letters) were dictated to a scribe.

It is intended in this article to analyse one of R. Abraham's letters⁴—which is unfortunately undated—dealing mainly with *devekuth*, the ideal way of life in Hasidic theory and practice.⁵

The letter is clearly divisible in two. The first part analyses the concept and practice of *devekuth* proper, whilst the second part analyses a secondary state of *devekuth*, namely, those phases in which, through lack of spiritual concentration, *devekuth* proper is not attainable. Both parts of the letter hold surprises for the student of the theory of Hasidic *devekuth*, as R. Abraham's doctrines on the subject contain much that is novel.

The epistle opens with an introduction on how to attain 'ayin (אין, the mystical *nihil*). This doctrine R. Abraham had taken over from the Great Maggid R. Dob Baer of Mezritch, who had developed it in two clearly distinguishable, though often intermingled, forms.

One formulation of the 'ayin doctrine by the Maggid urges a mystical 'anawah, that is humility and self-abasement before God. It is practised in contemplative exercises leading to the mystical annihilation of self. As the contemplative Hasid annihilates himself, viz., his individual consciousness, the vacuum thus created within his soul is immediately filled by a new content. His soul is invaded by God., viz., the Divine *Shekhinah*. The withdrawal of the human *ego* from his individual consciousness conduces to the entry of the divine *ego*. In this process the *Shekhinah* or God takes the place of the human *ego* that has been converted to 'ayin. According to the Maggid this process is not an act of grace but is almost as natural as if a law of spiritual *horror vacui* were at work. The expulsion of the human *ego* is the necessary requirement for the soul's attaining to its divine nature. The ways of self-annihilation, well-known to mystics of all ages, thus form an important element in the teaching of the Great Maggid. To him 'anawah is not so much social humility but a mystic-contemplative self-abasement of man before his Maker. The technique of self-annihilation and of the passive retreat of the

⁴ It is published among the letters which form the Appendix of the book *Pri ha-Arets*, by R. MENAHEM MENDEL, of Vitebsk, Kopyst, 1814. Some copies of this ed. do not contain the Appendix.

⁵ Cf. G. SCHOLEM, "Devekuth in early Hassidism," *Review of Religion* xv, 1950, pp. 115-39.

soul possesses unmistakable marks of ecstasy; the ecstatic atmosphere so clearly noticeable throughout the writings of the Maggid is partly due to them. But the Maggid speaks also of '*anawah*' as humility in its accepted moralistic connotation, *i.e.*, as a quality of conduct between man and man. It is clear that the latter kind of '*anawah*' contains no ecstatic elements. It implies the deliberate weighing of the merits of one's fellow man against one's own, with a view to recognising one's own deficiencies as greater and graver.

It is characteristic of R. Abraham of Kalisk that when he speaks of attaining the state of '*ayin*', he thinks of it not in its ecstatic meaning but as an attitude of social humility plain and simple. He makes use of all the terminology of his teacher, the Great Maggid, but evades all its ecstatic implications. By '*ayin*' he does not mean the mystical '*ayin*' and by '*anawah*' he does not mean ecstatic self-abasement. In his own words:

" . . . the final aim of *Torah* and *Hokhmah* . . . is to attain the perfect '*ayin*', wherefore a man should render his self non-existent; the very source of Wisdom is '*ayin*'. '*Ayin*' is its very root and from this root grow humility and lowliness, even as our sages said: 'The *Torah* is fulfilled only by him who makes himself like the desert,' free to poor and rich alike, and who regards himself as no greater than his fellowman, but feels 'non-existent' before him. In this way they [*scil.* man and his fellow man] are integrated (מתכללים) one into the other, for '*ayin*' combines a thing and its opposite, and therefrom results the straight line which encompasses peace and blessing."

It is worth noting how formulæ and expressions which in the works of the Maggid are reserved for the realm of mystic and ecstatic '*ayin*', are applied by the writer to the context of social humility. השגת האין "the attainment of '*ayin*,'" a characteristic expression of the Maggid denoting ecstatic self-annihilation, is divested by R. Abraham of its mystical sense and is used of self-annihilation in terms of human relationships. R. Dob Baer's frequent exhortation "to render oneself '*ayin*'" and his use of the scriptural verse והחכמה מאין תמצא (Job xxviii, 12) are now understood in a moralistic sense. The Maggid's term במציאות "non-existent," denoting the state of mystical ecstasy or "annihilation," is employed by R. Abraham in the sense of practising social humility. Here the Maggid's most cherished mystical concept is converted into a non-mystical virtue. This clearly points to a non-mystical, at least non-

ecstatic tendency of R. Abraham. To the Maggid, 'ayin is one of the supreme metaphysical principles—that of *coincidentia oppositorum*. To R. Abraham it is, characteristically, the principle of reciprocal humility which conduces to peace in human relationships.

2. The second section of the epistle deals with 'emunah (faith) as the alpha and omega of all religious values. The highest duty is the pursuit after simple things “and Faith is the simplest thing, and equally obtainable by every person.” “Faith has no limits: with it man begins, with it he ends.” What R. Abraham says in this letter is in full accord with what he says elsewhere. He insists most emphatically on the primacy of Faith. “Great is Faith . . . in that it supersedes human reasoning.”⁶

3. The writer proceeds to urge the shunning of jealousy as an objectionable form of human relationships, and points with great emphasis to the fact that Hillel the Elder declared the verse “Love thy neighbour as thyself” to be the principal commandment of the Torah. The relationship between man and man is the pivot round which the thoughts of R. Abraham revolve; time and again he comes back to this theme which seems to hold him in a spell. Without apparent logical transition he then proceeds to give an exposition of the concept of *devekuth*.

4. *Devekuth* denotes for R. Abraham man's emotional relationship with God. One of his frequent expressions is “The sense of Love and Fear (of God) which flows down upon us, is the *devekuth* between ourselves and Him, blessed be He.” It indicates that for him *devekuth* is not an active but a passive state. This interesting point is further borne out by what follows. Simultaneous and commensurate with man's self-discipline in *devekuth* is the Divine help which complements it. Here R. Abraham passes on to the main-spring of his theory. “The truth of the matter is that Divine Providence is in accordance with the *devekuth* that exists between ourselves and Him, blessed be He, and commensurate with man's own *devekuth* is the exercise of Providence towards the person who never withdraws his thought and *devekuth* from Him. Should anyone allow his thoughts to turn away from Him for a time, then during that period Providence will recede from that person.”

⁶ *Likkutei 'Amarim*, by R. MENAHEM MENDEL, of Vitebsk, Lemberg, 1911, pt. ii, p. 41b. Every student of Hasidism will see at a glance that only the second part of this book contains material emanating from R. Menahem; the first part is clearly a collection of homilies of the Great Maggid.

This is a new idea in the history of Hasidic *devekuth*. *Devekuth* and *hashgahah* (Providence) are correlated here for the first time: God's Providence towards an individual depends on that individual's *devekuth*. It is only a deduction from this principle that "if a person who, as a rule, is spiritually perfect happens to be affected by adverse circumstances, the reason must be sought in temporary *shikhehah* (forgetfulness, non-awareness, insensibility of the Divine) and cessation of *devekuth*. . . . According to the measure of his forgetfulness and the length of time it persists will be the duration of the adverse conditions from which God may preserve us."

This theory of R. Abraham is new, indeed revolutionary in the history of Hasidic *devekuth*, which had not previously known this combination. Outside Hasidism it is, of course, as old as Maimonides' *Guide*, to whose conception of Providence (*Guide* pt. iii, ch. 51) R. Abraham's doctrine bears a strong resemblance. In fact, the almost slavish dependence of R. Abraham on Maimonides, both as regards the theory and its formulation, is apparent from a comparison of the texts concerned.

5. However, after this rather slavish following of the *Moreh*, the surprising originality of our author becomes apparent when he goes on to describe the spiritual state known in Hasidic literature as *katnuth* (lit. "littleness"). From R. Israel Baal Shem onwards, *devekuth* was understood in empiric, psychological terms as occurring in alternations of exaltation and lowness, high and low tide, climax and anti-climax of the spiritual life. The low tide was usually termed *katnuth* and the high tide *gadluth* (lit. "greatness"). Dissipation of the spirit and lack of spiritual concentration are the marks of the former, even as intensive concentration of the soul upon God is the mark of the latter, which is considered throughout Hasidic literature as the ideal state. Various theories developed in Hasidism concerning the rôle of this lowness of spirit in which *devekuth* diminishes or ceases altogether as a consequence of the great spiritual effort preceding it.

Now R. Abraham too recognises this state and also calls it *katnuth*, i.e., a state of lower value. But the rôle he assigns to this state is one unthought of by his Hasidic predecessors. According to him the phase of *katnuth*, occurring at a time when the emotional concentration upon God is not possible, offers the leisure-time necessary for emotional concentration of the soul upon the fellow-man.

Katnuth, in R. Abraham's view, is not simply an emotional desert but the choicest opportunity for "loving one's neighbour," and one should wholeheartedly avail oneself of this opportunity. In its ideal form *katnuth* has a positive function and constitutes "*devekuth* with the neighbour." Whenever the supreme form of *devekuth*, that with God, is impossible of attainment, it should be taken up in a modified form in which it can be realised, namely, in the human or social context. Here again the object of *devekuth* is not God but man.

"Just because there is no man who is never subject to *katnuth* of his intellect or to a cessation of *devekuth* with God, He clearly commanded us in His Torah 'Love thy neighbour as thyself'; for love brings about *devekuth*—the clinging together of many as one man. Similarly there is no person who does not at one time or another experience the influx of true *devekuth* while his fellow-man is idle [in *devekuth*]. When they regard themselves as one, it [i.e., the *devekuth*] can be gained by him through the *devekuth* of his companion and through the latter's cleaving to God . . ."

Here we have a community of contemplative individuals cleaving to God and also bound one to another: Gone is the isolation which the individual suffers whilst in a state of *katnuth*, when he is estranged from God. Through the new human bond a new sense of belonging is created.

6. The most important aspect of *devekuth* with one's fellow-man is that it is calculated to lead, albeit in a roundabout manner, back to the same security as *devekuth* with God. This security is guaranteed because one is in *devekuth* with one's fellow-man who in turn is (or, at any rate, should be) in *devekuth* with God himself. To be isolated means to be unprotected. Joining a human relationship offers the unprotected individual a new, this time human, shelter which is still under Divine Providence. From the context in R. Abraham's dissertation it is not quite clear whether the ideal *devekuth* in the phase of *katnuth* is just a matter between two individuals, one cleaving to the other and the other cleaving to God, or whether it is a matter of collective *devekuth* in which a whole group participates, in that some members are cleaving to God and some to each other.

" . . . for all the members of the body receive Divine Providence through being connected with the brain and heart and these

receive more Divine Providence and Protection than all the other parts of the body since they are closer to the life-essence (*hiyyuth*) and to the Attachment and to the *devekuth*. Nevertheless, by way of these all other parts of the body are also recipients of Providence."

What exactly is the sociological situation implied in this theory? For a moment it seems as if R. Abraham, in the above passage, had in mind the relation of Hasidim to the *Şaddik* (the brain and heart of the allegory), the latter constituting *devekuth* in his own person and all of them receiving a share of Providence through *devekuth* with the *Şaddik*. "The saying of our teachers," writes R. Abraham, "'A *mişvah* brings a *mişvah* in its train, and a transgression brings a transgression in its train' has been said not necessarily of one person, but of all who cleave to a perfect man. Is it not reasonable that anyone attached to him is the more readily drawn—by reason of being bound to him—to holy deeds and, similarly, to transgressions? It is indeed clearly taught in our teachings: 'When it is well with the righteous man, it is well with his neighbour, etc.'"

This is clearly enough an allusion to the *Şaddik*, but soon this theory of *devekuth* between man and perfect man proves to be a special case within the general theory of *dibbuk ḥaverim* (close association of friends of equal status). In a description which follows immediately on the foregoing passage in his letter he writes: "... and thus within the *dibbuk ḥaverim* who hearken intently to the voice of God, *Miṣvah* and *Torah* are certainly extended and continued through *devekuth* with men who are themselves cleaving (*devukim*) to God." The use here of the expression *dibbuk ḥaverim* and of the plural אנשים ("men") implies that R. Abraham does not refer to the *devekuth* of Hasidim with their *Şaddik*, but rather to mutual *devekuth* among men. And indeed *dibbuk ḥaverim* is the keyword in R. Abraham's system, whereas the *Şaddik* plays a very unimportant rôle in it. One would be tempted to formulate it this way: *Saddikism*, to R. Abraham, is but one form in the varieties of *dibbuk ḥaverim*. What R. Abraham has in mind in the above passage is something like a closely knit group of companions in a state of *devekuth* with God. It is the first time in the history of Hasidism that clear expression is given to the idea of the value of the Hasidic community *per se* as distinct from its dependence

on the *Ṣaddik*. What comes to the fore here is the autonomous value of *dibbuk ḥaverim* as such.⁷

7. This social significance of the contemplative community which is, in principle, independent of the *Ṣaddik*, is apparent from a piece of practical advice given by R. Abraham in the course of the same letter. Discussing the needs of the individual, R. Abraham refers to the aforementioned theory that harm comes to a person only when there is a weakening on his part in his *devekuth* with God. From this it follows that all that is necessary in order to escape harm is the strengthening of the individual's attachment to the contemplative community whose members are bound together by love in the fulfilment of the commandment "Love thy neighbour as thyself." The integration of the individual in this emotional community will, of itself, effect the extension of Divine Providence also to him. Despite his temporary inability to participate directly in the members' *devekuth* with God, he yet does, through membership of the group, become part of them.

"It is a wonderful boon for the individual to have continuously the advantage of Divine Providence through his associates who are attached in *devekuth* with God, and to be eligible for all good things and success in the uplift of body and soul; and it is possible that this is the meaning of the saying 'A person to whom a misfortune has happened—heaven forbid—should inform others (*רבים*, lit. "the many") of his suffering, those others being persons who seek Heaven's mercy on his behalf.' The Rabbis did not say the others 'should seek' (*יבקשו*) mercy for him but that they do—as a matter of course—seek (*מבקשים*) mercy. Evidently this dictum speaks of someone who conducts himself in accordance with Torah and its central principle, namely, the *miṣvah* 'Love thy neighbour as thyself.' Now if some misfortune befall him, at a time such as has been described, all he needs to do is to make his misfortune known to the many with whom he is in a relationship of *devekuth* and who are themselves protected by Divine Providence from suffering and distress by the abundance of their *devekuth* with

⁷ A later variation on the same idea is to be found in *Maor Va-Shemesh*, by R. KALONYMUS KALMAN, of Cracow.

"... ונראה לפרש הענין כך כי בהתאסף עדי צאן קדושים אל הצדיק... וכל אחד ואחד ישמע לחברו ויהיה קשן בעיני עצמו ויהי רוצה לשמוע איהו דבר מחבירו איהו בחינה האריך לעבוד את השי"ת והיאך למצוא את השי"ת וכן כולם יהיו כך וממילא שהאסיפה היא על זה הכוונה או ממילא יותר מה שהענין רוצה לינק הפרדה רוצה להניק ממילא הקב"ה מקרב עצמו אליהם ונמצא עמהם ונפתח להם ממילא כל הישועות... ממקור חרחמים... וחסדים טובים... נמשך על כנסת ישראל... ומפרש הפסוק ושמעו בני יעקב פה שאתם בני יעקב שמעו עצמיכם זה לזה כדכתיב גבי מלאכין ומקבלין דין מן דין...". (פרי יחיד ר"ה הקבוצו). Here the *Ṣaddik* does not seem to have any function at all.

God. Thus those who are in trouble live under the divine protection which shields them [*i.e.*, through those in full *devekuth*]. In order that the perfect ones might suffer neither pain nor grief, he, too, will have Divine Providence extended to him when they become aware of his grief. Thus [the communication of one's distress to the contemplative colony] in itself constitutes a seeking of mercy. For this reason the Rabbis did not say 'they should seek' but 'they seek.' This is, too, what Scripture means when it says 'that redeemed my soul with peace' (Ps. lv, 19), that is to say, the attachment of love and peace to the many has redeemed my soul 'from such as advanced upon me,' *i.e.*, from trouble-makers—Heaven forbid—whether they menace the body or the soul. 'That saved my soul,' thanks to 'the many who were with me' (*כי ברבים היו עמדי*), that is through the many seeking divine mercy for me."

R. Abraham sums up his advice, which almost amounts to an early attempt at group-therapy, with these words:

"What it all comes to is this: that which brings about Divine Protection and Providence whereby one may be rescued from misfortunes, is the abundance of the sense of man's love and fear of his Maker. Protection against what may happen in the future at a time when man is in a state of *katnuth* and experiences a cessation of *devekuth* consists in a common bond, love and true peace found in *dibbuk haverim*. When man is without either [*devekuth* or *dibbuk haverim*] he is one from whom the Divine Countenance is hidden, may God save us from being in such a state."

Indeed, it is advisable to be in a state of *devekuth* with close friends. When one of the circle falls out of *devekuth* with God into a state of *katnuth*, he then cleaves to his associates. The contemplative colony can assure all its members a fair amount of security, since the Divine Providence is guaranteed to the whole fellowship through those members who are, at the time concerned, fortunate enough to be in complete *devekuth* with God. The portion of Providence is to be shared by all members.

8. The letter ends with a salutation and an exhortation to foster good relations between men; cleaving to God is not even mentioned. The reader of R. Abraham's letter gets the impression that although in R. Abraham's view *dibbuk haverim* is no more than a helpful remedy in moments of *katnuth*, he really is more interested in the formulation of the emotional values of *dibbuk haverim* than

in the formulation of the contemplative values of *devekuth* proper with the Maker:

“And now children come hearken unto me. . . . Whoever is smitten by his conscience let him, for the sake of God and for his own sake, act as follows: Let him seek peace and fortify it . . . and if, Heaven forbid, his heart urges (lit. hustles) him to separate himself from the fellowship of men, let him hasten swiftly to his spiritually stronger brethren who truly and intently obey the voice of God, and say to them ‘My brethren-in-soul, save me and let me hear the word of God that He may heal my broken heart.’ Moreover, let this man school himself to fill his heart with love for his fellows even if it should lead to the departure of the soul. Let him persevere in this until his soul and the soul of his brethren cleave together. And when they have all become as one, God will dwell in their midst, and they will receive from Him an abundance of salvation and consolation. . . .”

Behind this florid style it is not difficult to discover the whole theory of R. Abraham concerning *dibbuk haverim* as a fundamental value that comes into play whenever man is unable to maintain a state of *devekuth* with God. Actually, however, *devekuth* with God is not mentioned at all in the closing exhortation. This is surely significant. For although *devekuth* with God is discussed in the course of R. Abraham’s letter, it yet seems as if for all practical purposes *devekuth* with one’s fellow has replaced *devekuth* with God. The difficulties of complete *devekuth* with God are fully recognised, if not to say taken for granted. Instead of exhortations to return to *devekuth* with God, it is hoped that the atomistic solitude of the individual, alienated from God in his state of *katnuth*, will be broken if and when he tries to find new human bonds into which he can integrate himself. The myth of the small contemplative group creates for him hope and the security of an intimate sheltering community. R. Abraham’s exhortations for peace among *haverim* are not merely the traditional clichés of Hebrew idiom in praise of the pursuit of peace. They give expression to a new value: that of the contemplative community whose members are bound together by the emotional values of sympathy and brotherhood, in the manner of revivalist communities whose members are held together by the binding power of intense emotional loyalty.

It should be noted that, according to the above, the emotional reintegration of the isolated and unprotected individual is not to be

achieved by means of the traditional concept of the Community of Israel (*kelal Israel*), semi-transcendental as it is and certainly devoid of any concrete social meaning. *Kelal Israel* would be a self-inviting, almost natural contemplative refuge for the alienated individual.⁸

R. Abraham, however, proposes an emotional integration within a small but concrete group (*dibbuk haverim*) and not within the vague, sociologically abstract entity of *kelal Israel*. It is precisely the belonging to such a small but closely knit group which gives, in R. Abraham's opinion, a distinctive sense of security of existence.

9. From the abstract theories in the epistle we have, so far, reconstructed the picture of an emotional group in which the psychological forces inherent in all group activity come into play. This picture is fully confirmed by a piece of practical advice given by R. Menahem of Vitebsk in one of his epistles which, incidentally, also fills some gaps left by his other writings. The letter in question, which is undated, is addressed to the *kehillah* of Bieshika and is published in Part II of *Likkute 'Amarim* (attributed to R. Menahem Mendel of Vitebsk), p. 5.⁹ After direction and advice on a study-schedule (which in itself would deserve detailed analysis), the writer proceeds to lay down rules of conduct in *dibbuk haverim*. We learn to our great surprise that one of the acts demanded is individual confession between friends. The exclusive tradition of collective confession in general terms, so characteristic of Judaism, is here breached. True enough, there had been previous attempts in that direction, as, for instance, by the Kabbalists of Safed, who developed a form of confession by the individual to a small group, not unlike what R. Menahem is advocating. It is unnecessary to point out that the obvious likeness notwithstanding, there is no direct historical connection between the experiment of the sixteenth-century Safed Kabbalists and that of the Tiberias Hasidim of the eighteenth century. Both are the expression of specific psychological needs which demanded satisfaction in the one instance as in the other. In the words of the epistle :

“ Let also every person see to it that he has close attachment

⁸ This advice for the emotional reintegration of the faithless individual within *Kelal Israel* has been given, e.g., by a contemporary *Saddik*, R. AHRON ROTH, of Jerusalem, in his *Mevakkesh Emunah* (Jerusalem, 1942).

⁹ The letter is in a fragmentary state; the beginning, the end, and the signature are missing. It is written probably by R. MENAHEM MENDEL, along with the bulk of the epistles duly signed by him. The only other possible author is R. ABRAHAM.

with kindred persons (*dibbuk haverim*) who are chosen with discrimination as being in sympathy with one's own mental and spiritual nature, men who seek only truth and who also desire to rid themselves of lust, insincerity, and falsehood. Then let him hold converse with them every day for about half an hour, and engage in self-reproof for the evil ways he sees in himself. His companion should do likewise. When he has accustomed himself to doing this, it will be found that when a person will see in a friend something wrong or objectionable and reprove him, he will not feel self-conscious before the other and will confess to the truth. Thus falsehood will fall and truth will begin to shine."

If we were to go more closely into R. Menahem's wording and observe that he sometimes uses the plural and in other cases the singular, we should deduce that the social set-up envisaged is, apparently, the following: There is a group of intimate friends, "kindred persons chosen with discrimination," who form the body of the emotional brotherhood. Perhaps the reciprocal confession is not carried out openly in a gathering of all members, but remains an individual confession between two companions. Such private conversation between two friends is also described in a letter written from Tiberias by R. Menahem Mendel. The writer quotes the authority of R. Jacob Emden to the effect that real love of one's fellow (*אהבת הברים*), profounder even than all moral exhortations, manifests itself when "a man speaks to another and tells him what is in his heart, even the counsel of his evil inclination (*יצר*) within him, for then the very speaking works salvation (*הנה הדיבור בעצמו פועל ישועות*). Then the evil inclination is forced out, for the 'two are better than the one,' the two *haverim* are superior to the one [*i.e.*, the lonely]. That which the two will confirm with the counsel of God is that which will endure." This fine perception of the therapeutic value of such uninhibited talking leaves no room for doubting that this custom was actually in vogue in the Hasidic circles in Tiberias among the followers of R. Menahem Mendel Vitebsker and R. Abraham Kalisker. Although there is no decisive evidence to show whether these intimate talks took place between two companions or (less likely) in the presence of more than two, it is clear that both R. Menahem and R. Abraham refer to one and the same practice.

10. Most striking of all in this context is the fact that the important Hasidic notion of the *Ṣaddik* as the charismatic leader

is not mentioned at all in our texts. There is no doubt that the confession of which we read was *not* a confession before the *Ṣaddik*, but rather an exchange of confessions between people of equal status. The custom of confession before the *Ṣaddik* is to be found here and there in the Hasidic movement. But more surprising than the fact that it is found at all is the fact that it is not found in far greater measure and force in an atmosphere so heavily charged with emotion and in an area in which the Christian practice of confession prevailed throughout. True enough, the Bratzlav Hasidim were popularly dubbed "*widduynikkes*" on account of their custom of confessing to the *Ṣaddik*. This custom was undoubtedly more widespread, and one cannot infer from the fact that this name was applied to the Bratzlav Hasidim that confession before the *Ṣaddik* was an essential and distinctive mark of this sect alone. R. Abigdor, the notorious opponent of R. Shneur Zalman of Ladi, mentioned in the official document of complaint against the Hasidim which he sent to the Russian Government, that the disciples of the Maggid regularly instruct those who wish to join them to confess before them.¹⁰ Here, as with the Bratzlav usage, the confession is clearly part of the initiation rite. The practice recommended in the letters of R. Menahem Mendel and R. Abraham is confession not before the *Ṣaddik*, but as between equals; neither is it part of an initiation ceremonial but a daily custom with the time to be spent thereon specifically recommended.

J. G. WEISS.

¹⁰ The practice seems to have started after the death of the Maggid. It is worth noting that Solomon Maimon, who gave us the most plastic description of the "court" of the Great Maggid, still stresses the fact that the initiated were not required to confess to the *Ṣaddik*: "Jeder Mensch . . . haette nichts mehr noetig, als sich an die hohen Obern zu wenden und *eo ipso* gehoerte er schon als Mitglied zu dieser Gesellschaft. Er habe nicht einmal noetig (wie es sonst mit Mediziniern der Fall ist), diesen hohen Obern von seinen moralischen Schwaechen, seiner bisher gefuehrten Lebensart und dergleichen etwas zu melden, indem diesen hohen Obern nichts unbekannt sei" (*Lebensgeschichte*, ed. Fromer, Munich, 1911, p. 198).

GLEANINGS FROM OXFORD MANUSCRIPTS (I)

It is about a century since Moritz Steinschneider sat in the Bodleiana in Oxford examining its Hebrew collections. Since his time the number of volumes of Hebrew manuscripts has risen to over 3,000. It seems fitting, therefore, to begin publication of additions and corrections to the catalogue of Hebrew manuscripts by A. Neubauer and Arthur Cowley (1886-1906). (The last volume of Genizah fragments is available in the oriental reading-room but not yet printed.) On the whole, the work has been done with exemplary care. Considering the manifold difficulties involved and the progress made since, there are in details quite a number of errors and omissions concerning (a) authors, (b) places, (c) dates, (d) censors, (e) owners, prices, customs, (f) types of script.

AUTHORS: Neubauer (=N.), no. 207 (I) lists "Bezaleel b. Hayyim's" super-commentary on Rashi (Pentateuch), called *be'er mayim hayyim*. No. (2) gives the date of the grammar by the same author as finished in 1579. But the author's name is misprinted. It is really a scholar of distinction whose name was thus obscured: Hayyim b. Bezaleel, brother of the MaHaRa¹ of Prague, as may be seen by comparison with the acrostics in N. 207 (f. 315^a) and N. 208 (f. 291^{a/b}). H is identical with the pupil of Solomon Luria and Shalom Shachna, whose manuscript (*yam she-'asah shelomoh*)² with his name in relief on the binding survives in the Oppenheimer collection too. H. was 'abh *beth din* in Friedberg (d. 1588) and parts of his still unpublished work were taken over by Simeon ha-levi of Osnabrueck. The date 1579 is not that of the grammar, but of the unnamed copyist (really Wendel Sack), who copied the whole volume (cf. f. 547^a) using different ink for (1) and (2) finishing it in the town of Rekingen (רייקינגין) some 50 km. South-West of Schaffhausen on Thursday, 25 Elul, 1579, i.e., in H's life-time. The work has considerable interest, because it was Luria and Shachna who together with Isserles led the Polish Rabbinic schools to fame.

Various other names not listed occur in this volume, e.g., owners: Isaac b. Asher called Eisik; Menahem b. Isaac (both

¹ Loewe b. Bezaleel.

² C. KARPELES, *Gesch. d. jüd. Lit.*, 2nd ed., II, p. 309, is mistaken in thinking that Shachna left no written works.

fly-1. 1^b). The exact date for the owner Meir (of) Wuerzburg (catalogue: Werzburg) is Friday, eve of Rosh ḥodesh, 1716; further we find Anshel Buchsbaum and the parnas Ensel (?), (f. 577).

Neubauer, No. 431 is described as Tosaphoth on Babha Qamma. It is really the ROSH on Babha Meṣi'a. The copy was finished not in 1708, but exactly on Sunday, 9 Shebhaṭ, 1709, in the same year as N. 762, the ṬAZ³ on 'ebhen ha-'ezer, and by the same scribe, Ephraim b. Šebhi Hirsch called Hirsch Loeb in Prague who was a descendant of R. Meir of Rothenburg. The correct date moreover in N. 762 is not Thursday, but Tuesday, 20 Iyyar, 1709 (f. 248^a). A comparison shows that Hirsch Loeb was one of the scribes employed by the great collector David Oppenheimer to copy in identical volumes supplied by the latter certain halakhic works, in order to fill the gaps in his library.

Neub. 766, the author of a commentary on *Hoshen ha-Mishpat*, is left out; it is really by Uri Dlugosz⁴ (דלונטש) of Satanow in Poland and contains a note (f. 218^b) signed by Moses Isaac Spira (שפירא) stating that his pupil R. Eisik of Tarny (טארני?), the grandson of the BaḤ,⁵ handed him this manuscript in the year 1712 at Bimsl, i.e., Mlada Boleslaw, Jung-Bunzlau in Bohemia. An unrecorded owner is Eliezer Lippmann (fly-1. 1^a).

Neub. 1178, Judah ha-levi's *Mi kamokhah*, a parody for Purim, was copied by Asher Ensel, who was a descendant in the fifth generation of the 'alluph R. Ḥayyim ha-kohen, 'abh beth din of Prague. Ḥ. is probably identical with Ḥayyim ha-kohen b. Isaac, Chief Rabbi of Moravia in Nikolsburg and head of a *yeshibhah* in Prague (d. middle seventeenth century), who was descended from Rabbi Loewe b. Bezaleel, part of whose manuscripts are also in the Oppenheimer collection. The fact that Ḥ.'s sister was Eva Bacharach, the family with which Oppenheimer was closely connected, makes the identification more likely, explaining at the same time why it came into the latter's collection. The booklet was meant to be read after the *Megillah* on the night of Purim.

PLACES: Neub. No. 258 records a Pentateuch commentary copied at "Sulzbach." In reality it is Sulzburg or Sulzbuerg (cf. f. 166^a), apparently in Middle Franconia. In N. 881 the owner

³ By David b. Samuel ha-levi (d. 1667).

⁴ For the identification of Polish and Russian names I am indebted to Professor JARRA.

⁵ By Joel Sirkes (d. 1640).

(f. 60^a) is not Isaac of Frankfort, but of Ebenfurth, north of Wiener Neustadt. In N. 1327 the owner Gershon does not hail from Fiasco (f. 2^a), but Montefiascone, ca. 80 km. north of Rome.

DATES: A sore chapter in Neubauer's great catalogue of manuscripts is the constant failure to date them approximately where no date is given, as was done by Margoliouth for the British Museum Hebrew catalogue. On the basis of different criteria the script can in most cases be dated at least to a century.

Neub. 480 contains undated novellæ on the Talmud. The author, the Worms Rabbi Samuel, is really the grandfather of Yair Hayyim Bacharach (d. 1702), Oppenheimer's correspondent. The manuscript, apparently an autograph, should be assigned to the former half of the seventeenth century.

Repeatedly, where dates are given errors have crept in: in Neub. 339 (the Hamburg Talmudist Mordecai Heksher's commentary on Proverbs etc.), the date of composition printed "1667-1675," should read Tebheth 536=1775 (f. 121^b), but the manuscript was copied really in 1784 (cf. title-page). The copyist's name is "wonderful" (ושמי פלא', cf. Jud. xiii, 18).

In Neub. 802, on divorce by Jacob Margoliouth, the year when the unnamed copyist finished his work is given as 1539. In reality the copyist is Aaron Samuel b. Israel (f. 76^b). The author himself is identical with J. Margoliouth of Nuremberg (d. 1492). However, this is one of the rare cases where the colophon in spite of its date does not indicate the date of copying. On reading the introduction by M.'s son Isaac (d. 1525) one will find some 20 authorities mentioned, among them Israel Brinzo [*sic*]. This is a curious spelling mistake (*i.e.*, ברניז < ברינזו) based on a contemporary cursive, which goes to show that this manuscript is a late copy, and that the colophon was recopied. Both script and binding (cf. also N. 807) likewise give the impression of one of the typical copies made for Oppenheimer and bound in brown leather with silver-gilt tooling, metal clasp, and gold edges.

Another famous example, where Dr. Teicher first suggested the colophon to be recopied, is Neub. 568, a *Mishneh Thorah* manuscript dated 1184, which has been used for correcting the text of the new American translation published by the Rabinowitz Foundation of Yale University. The date falls into Maimuni's lifetime and the text appearing in three columns in a remarkable tight small script is in fact superior to that of most other manuscripts

of this work, but an Italian note (by G. B. De Rossi?) not quite without foundation ascribes (flyleaf 2^b) the manuscript to the year 1366. In any case, according to Dr. Edelman a dated fourteenth-century copy in exactly the same script is owned by the Simon-seniana in Copenhagen. N. calls the script "Greek," but it is no doubt a rare type of Sephardi.⁶

The disregard of week-days is another source of errors, as by the way Zunz has shown with regard to dates given by De Rossi. Neub. 1590, a copy of Mattathiah Delacrut's commentary on Gikatil'ia's well-known *Sha'are 'orah*, was finished according to N. on 9 Shebhat, 5353=1593. According to the colophon that day was a Thursday. The 9 Shebhat, 5353, however, was a Tuesday. The correct reading is *ושמחת לפק* (f. 26^b), i.e., Thursday, 9 Shebhat, [5]359, which date does in fact correspond to Thursday, February 4, 1599.

Neub. 1659 (Solomon Molcho's sermons), gives as the date when the copy was finished: 26 Tebheth, 5434=1675. According to the colophon that day was a Tuesday. The 26 Tebheth, 5434, however, was a Thursday. For the date we find a somewhat cryptic entry (f. 1^a) *לכ"ן (b) אמ"ר (c) לבניי (d) יום ניםל . . .* "לפ"ק ישראל ונו חסר חד" (d). The key for the calculation here lies in the fact that *ל* refers to the whole word and *י* to single letters and,

⁶ Cf. also C. BERNHEIMER, *Paleogr. ebr.*, 1924, p. 112; Neubauer, plates, No. XXIII. An examination of the colophon with ultra-violet rays shows that, although one letter has been reinked, the copyist did write *חוקמה*=1184. The same type of script occurs in Neub. 1250, a Moreh' Nebhukhim wrongly described as "Greek," with a Spanish owner of 1356 and typical Spanish illumination of the time (following Dr. PAECHT). Although very rare, the same type of script, though larger, appears once in a Genizah fragment (N. 2723, f. 1a/b), a liturgy; its script is wrongly called "Syrian." [There is some misunderstanding here on Mr. LEHMANN's part. I have not suggested that the date of the *Mishneh Torah* (Neub. No. 568) was recopied from an older manuscript. In my opinion, the date 1184 was forged by changing the letter *resh* into *qof*. The real date of the MS. is thus 1284, and its script is Catalan.—J.L.T.] As to the preceding note: 33 facsimiles of *Catalan* Hebrew manuscripts have been published by J. Millàs Vallicrosa in *Documents Hebraïcs De Jueus Catalans*, Barcelona, 1927. None of them, as a detailed comparison with the Oxford MS. shows, really agrees with it. But the Copenhagen MS. does. Its place and date support our contention. Its colophon runs: "I am Levi be-R. Isaac Pigo Karo . . . from the area of Salamanca. I have written this book called the Guide of the Perplexed . . . for . . . the physician R. Menahem Bezaleel and have written it here at Barcelona and finished it in the year 108 . . ." (i.e., 1348). The writing belongs to the district of his birth, not to Barcelona. Another MS. of the Guide, Cod. Vat. Heb. 256, written at Barcelona in 1358, likewise does not agree in script with the Oxford and Copenhagen MSS. (cf. Tisserant, *Specimina*, 1914, pl. 17a). The script is, therefore, hardly Catalan. Further examples of this remarkable script are, besides N.568: the Oxford MSS. Heb. d.80 (f.40a/b); Heb. d.79 (f.27-32), which fits together with Heb. d.27 (f.3-4) and the Vatican Cod. Heb. 92, which has a watermark datable between 1343-86 (cf. Spec. pl. 19a).—O.H.L.

because the original probably had *aleph lamed* written together in one letter, the scribe adds "minus one," i.e., $a=100+b=241+c=92+d=41-1=[5]473$. The 26 Tebheth, 5473, was in fact a Tuesday, exactly Tuesday, January 25, 1713.

CENSORS: Considerable interest with regard to dating, particularly in manuscripts passing through or written in Italy, attaches to censors' entries. Neubauer in his catalogue omitted all the censors, while Cassuto included them in his bibliographies. Often the censors help to localise the texts at a given period.

In Neub. 541 appear three censors (f. 93^b), all converts, the ubiquitous Dominico Irosolomita[n]o (later Irosolomi[ta]no),⁷ Aless[and]ro Sc[ipi]one, lo[ren]zo franguelo [*sic*].⁸ As the rare spelling of Dominico's name shows, this is probably an early stage of the three censor commission in Mantua in 1595 (they seem to have left Mantua already in 1596). Dominico was chairman and therefore signs first. The date thus inferred is the only one in the manuscript and localises it in Mantua at the end of the sixteenth century.

Censors not recorded by Neubauer or Popper: In Neub. 176, a precious booklet on the Targum Onkelos discovered by S. D. Luzzatto in an attic among worn-out sacred books about to be buried, occurs one Eusebio who was active in Rome. His entry runs as follows "[r]euiso p[er] me eusebio senior⁹ del ordine del molto Rvdo padre inquisitor di roma" (f. 90^a). The manuscript called *Pathshegen* was copied in 1451 and according to an entry on the fly-leaves was hidden away in the Beth Midrash of R. Isaac Foa.

In Neub. 354 occurs the "Heuesas" about whom Popper is in doubt (p. 91). The entry runs as follows (f. 69^b): "Bernard. Hevesas e[x] offici[o] Parmæ." Popper misread Bernard, as Reverendissimus.¹⁰ Other censors in this volume are: fra luigi da Bologna 1600; fra Prospero Ruggieri . . . Reggio del 1669.

In Neub. 847 we find "Alix[and]ro [*sic*] de caii¹¹ reuedetor adi 23 lullio 1559," further an interesting full entry: "An[toni]o

⁷ Not "always" as PORGES has it (*A. Berliner-Festschrift*, 1903, p. 278, No. 15).

⁸ Not "always" Laurentius Franguellus as PORGES maintains (*loc. cit.*, No. 11).

⁹ Suggested by Dr. D. M. ROGERS.

¹⁰ W. POPPER, *Censorship*, 1899, pl. III, No. 2.

¹¹ Not "cari," as BISCIONI (*Catalogus*) has it.

di medicis ho revisto il detto liber p[er] comision del . . . inq[uisi]tor del santo uficio di Ancona," dated January 10, 1629.

Sometimes limits of time or place were laid down by the censors, or the cancellation had to be acknowledged by the owner with his signature: In Neub. 1392 the censor, Fr. Alex[ande]r Longus, who belongs to Monreale, enters "conceditur ad tempus vist. et donec visitetur" (f. 227^b/228^a). Or else the restriction might be local: "Imprimātūr sed non deportantur extra calcographiā¹² sine licentia Inq[uisito]ris Veron[æ]" (N. 176, f. 1^a). Possibly Isaac Foa also belongs to Verona.

Repeatedly a second entry helps to correct earlier identifications. In one entry Popper¹³ reads: "P[er]mittitur jussu . . . Inq[uisito]ris . . . 1589 Pæbris (?) Zomegnius." In Neub. 1944, at the end of Gikatilia's *Sha'are sedeq* (f. 43^b), is found the following entry: "Permittitur iussu R[everendissimi] Inq[uisito]ris taurini Zomegnius P[ater] 1589 15 9 bris" (=Novembris). Accordingly we should read in Popper "p[rimo] X bris" (=Decembris).

OWNERS, PRICES, AND CUSTOMS: To investigate entries of such character as these belongs to the most fascinating aspects of the study of Hebrew manuscripts. Many a pious hand enters here the births and deaths of father, mother, and children, in some cases genealogies going back to the eleventh century as in Neub. No. 544. The exact range of those entries is sometimes no longer easy to recognise. Neub. 1518 contains such entries not only from 1573-1613, but really from 1473-1513 and then on to 1592, quite apart from the fact that the 17th Heshwan, 5342, is not 1582 but 1581, and that Moses Guenzburg bought the book not on 22 but 20 Siwan, 1660. In the Oppenheimer collection alone there are family-manuscripts of some of the most distinguished Jewish families like Meir of Rothenburg, Loewe b. Bezaleel, Bacharach, Eybeschitz, etc. A selection of additions to those less well known must here suffice.

In Neub. 861 we find as an owner Hirtz zum wieszen Schwanen [*sic*] (f. 177^b); in Neub. 649 there appear Josselin zum Kessel and Lippmann zum schwarzen Schild in Frankfort, the ancestor of the Schwarzschild family.

Unnoticed by Neub. appears repeatedly an owner who acquired a certain amount of fame as a collector named 'Ish Ger, e.g., in

¹² Printing establishment (D. M. Rogers).

¹³ *Op. cit.*, pl. V, No. 6.

Neub. 1297, *i.e.*, Abraham Graziano, the seventeenth-century rabbi at Modena. Quite a number of manuscripts from his library are now in Oxford. There are other great names like that of the address in Neub. 881 to "Herrn Joseph David Oppenheim, Kayserl. Factor" (last fly-l.), or else entries which strike one as rather original.

An owner who occurs repeatedly always draws a ladder, for his name is Isaac Leiter as in Neub. 1423 (f. 19), or at Hamburg there appears Zalman Kokhabh, for in that town Z. Stern from Rechnitz in Hungary finished his copy on Adar 13, [5]602=1842.

Considerable cultural interest attaches to prices, mostly unrecorded, paid for manuscripts. For Neub. 267, a commentary on the Pentateuch called *Yoreh de'ah* in quarto size, an owner paid 230 *lebhanim*, or Neub. 400, Maimuni's commentary on tractate *Zera'im* in small folio, was bought for 20 dirhems by Ebiathar b. Se'adiah.

Piety has left its traces in various ways. In Neub. 711, an illuminated Sephardi copy of the *Tur*, there is a magnificent judgment scene painted in exquisite colours by an artist of the Renaissance (f. 135^b). However, some over-pious owner centuries ago used his thumb to rub out the head of the presiding judge enthroned on his seat!

Another, yet charming, pious custom is laid down in Neub. 504 containing undated novellæ on the Talmud described as "modern." In reality the copy of the manuscript is dated 5317=1557 (f. 6^a). Its most curious feature are a large number of people inscribing themselves at the top of the pages, mostly one to a page, including the rabbi, Meir, the cantor, Mordecai, etc. (f. 27^{aff}). They were apparently members of a seventeenth-century Talmud *ḥebhrah* who perpetuated themselves in this way.

PROBLEMS OF SCRIPT: The identification of types of script used in certain areas is sometimes more difficult than that of personal names. In this field a great deal of work is still to be done. Here sometimes even Neubauer lost patience. So under Neub. 1636 he enters "owner: Ḥayyim ben Joseph (family name illegible)" (f. 111^a). The illegible name is that of Heimann Michael, whose manuscripts N. had for years been cataloguing! Comparison of handwritings often leads to surprising results: Neub. 1832 (1) is a commentary on Bahya's Pentateuch-commentary, not *Ḥobhoth*

ha-lebhabhoth,¹⁴ by Elijah Loans, who is identical with the Worms rabbi who died in 1636. A comparison with other autographs, *i.e.*, N. 1829-30, as well as the ornamentation, show that this manuscript was written by the same hand, *i.e.*, it is likewise an autograph. N. gives the impression that (2), the "Kabbalistic notes," are by a different copyist, but with the exception of two folios, all the items were copied by the author himself.

Repeatedly, Neubauer's identifications of certain types of script are open to criticism. Moses Zakkuth's Zohar commentary is described as in Sephardi characters. Certainly up to fol. 170^a the script is Ashkenazi. The copyist is not mentioned in the catalogue; he is Azriel b. Samuel of Krotoshin, who finished it on Tishri 17, [5]459 = 1698. The first of the two hands is the same that occurs in Neub. 1733, *i.e.*, Azriel's. The colophon was written by a second hand.

A category repeatedly applied by Neubauer is that of a "Greek" type of script; but in reality it has in many cases been used only because the script did not seem to fit into any of the well-known categories. Neub. 1937, the TaRYaG, is a case in point; its script is not Greek but rather Sephardi.

Another category classified variously as "Spanish" or "German" is in reality North Italian. Neub. 643, Isaiah di Trani the younger's Halakhoth in "Spanish" characters are a case in point. Here both a censor of 1597 and an owner of 1432 write in North Italian characters.

O. H. LEHMANN.

Oxford.

¹⁴ As stated in Jewish Encycl. VIII, p. 143.

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. SOME INSTANCES OF THE ENCLITIC *-m* IN JOB

The enclitic particle *-m(a)* is familiar to students of Akkadian and Ugaritic, although its origin is obscure.¹ Syntactically, it may be added to a finite verb, it may interpose between the infinitive absolute and the verb,² it is appended to nouns and may even intervene between the construct and its genitive.³ Its function with verbs and nouns alike is emphasis and/or stylistic variation.⁴

The enclitic *-m* has been recognised in recent times as existing in Biblical Hebrew in numerous passages, having been mistaken by the Massoretes for the possessive or pronominal suffix or for the preposition מ.⁵

Further Biblical examples would seem to be presented by the following passages in the book of Job:

1. V, 15 וישע מחרב מפיהם ומיד חזק אביון

The imbalance of the parallelism is obvious. The sequence מחרב מפיהם is extraordinary. Syr., Targ., and Vulg. all omit the preposition and read מחרב פיהם,⁶ "from the sword of their mouth," figurative for calumny.⁷

Ewald, Fried. Delitzsch, Dhorme, emend to *moḥorabh*. However, this root is nowhere else used of persons and would be an unlikely parallel to אביון.⁸

¹ For a comprehensive review of the literature, see M. POPE, Ugaritic Enclitic *-m*, *JCS* V (1951), pp. 123-128.

² For an example in Akkadian, cf. *su-ta-aš-bu-tum-ma us-ta-ša-ab-ba-at*, "I verily caused to be undertaken" (*Archives Royales De Mari*, III, viii, 16-17). Similarly, in Ugaritic: *b'l hmdm yhmdm*, "Baal verily covets" (GORDON *Ugaritic Handbook*, Rome, 1947, II, 75, i, 38).

³ v. GORDON, *ibid.*, pp. 44, 90.

⁴ POPE, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

⁵ Cf. GINSBERG, *JRAS* (1935), p. 47; *JBL*, LXII (1943), p. 115; LXIX (1950), p. 54; ALBRIGHT, *JBL*, LXIII (1944), p. 215, n. 45; p. 219, n. 83; *CBQ*, VII (1945), p. 23; GORDON, *op. cit.*, p. 115, n. 4; GASTER, *JQR*, XXXVII (1946), p. 65, n. 32; p. 58, n. 9; PATTON, *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms* (1944), p. 12. DAHOOD, *Biblica*, 33 (1952), p. 194; CROSS & FREEDMAN, *JBL*, LXXII (1953), p. 26, n. 41; p. 28, n. 63; REIDER, *JJS*, III (1952), 78-79; *HUCA*, XXIV (1952-53), p. 97.

⁶ So the reading in 20 MSS. v. G. BEER, *Text des Buches Hiob* (1895). But these probably represent scribal attempts at removing the difficulty.

⁷ For the connection of "sword" with "mouth," cf. Ps. lviii, 5, ולשונם חרב חדה, שנינו חרב לשונם, 4, חריבות בשפתיהם lix, 8.

⁸ For other, more radical, emendations, see the commentaries.

It is here suggested that the translation of the Syr., Targ., and Vulg. be adopted in respect of this phrase without resort to textual emendation. The preposition in מִפִּיהֶם is the enclitic *-m* to be attached to the preceding word to read מִחֶרֶב(מ) פִּיהֶם is the object of וישע and the *Waw* of וּמִיד is epexegetical. The meaning is that God protects the needy from slanderous accusation and physical violence. The translation is:

"He delivers the needy from the sword of their mouth, yea from the hand of the strong."

2. VII, 15 וּתְבַחֵר מִחֶנֶק נַפְשִׁי מוֹת מַעֲצָמוֹתִי

The preposition with the final word has either yielded the awkward translation "... death rather than these my bones," or misled the translators into emending מַעֲצָמוֹתִי to מַעֲצָבוֹתִי, "... death rather than my pains." If, however, the preposition be taken as the enclitic of the preceding מוֹת(מ) the perfect balance of the two parallel clauses is restored. מוֹת becomes the object of וּתְבַחֵר. The correct translation is then "So that my soul (=I) chooseth strangulation, my bones (=I) death."

3. VIII, 8 כִּי שְׂאֵל־נָא לְדֶר רִישׁוֹן וְכוֹנֵן לַחֲקֵר אֲבוֹתָם

The possessive suffix with אֲבוֹת is inconsistent with the parallel clause and unlikely within the context. Both the LXX and Vulg. omit the suffix, while Syr. and Targ. translate it. The difficulty may be satisfactorily overcome by regarding it as the enclitic *-m*. The translation is:

"For inquire, I pray thee, of the former generation, and apply thyself to that which the fathers have searched out."

4. VIII, 18 אִם יִבְלַעְנוּ מִמָּקְמוֹ וְכַחַשׁ בּוֹ וְכוּ'

As the text stands, the subject of יִבְלַעְנוּ must either be "He," i.e., God, or "one." It is true, God is mentioned in v. 20, but the two verses do not form a contextual unity. In fact, God as the subject would be very strange in view of the particular verbs used. The translation "one" adds nothing to the interpretation of the verse. The difficulty lies in the preposition in מִמָּקְמוֹ. If this be taken as the enclitic *-m* belonging to the preceding יִבְלַעְנוּ(מ) the

⁹ For the combination || נֶפֶשׁ עֲצָמוֹת cf. Ps. vi, 3-4; xxxv, 9-10; Prov. xvi, 24. Cf. Isa. lxvi, 14 עֲצָמוֹת; לב || עֲצָם, Prov. xv, 30, לב || עֲצָם.

difficulty disappears. מקמו is the subject of both verbs and the translation is:

"If his place devour him and then deny him (saying), 'I have not seen thee.'"¹⁰

5. XV, 18 אשר חכמים תידו ולא כחדו מאבותם

To avoid the obviously impossible rendering "and have not hid from their fathers," the translations resort to a *tour de force* and take כחדו ולא parenthetically, with מאבותם meaning, "having received it from their fathers." Clearly the second clause exactly expresses the first negatively and אבותם must be the subject of כחדו. LXX and Vulg. both omit the preposition from מאבותם. If this be taken as the enclitic of the preceding verb (כחדוֹם), the perfect balance of the parallelism is restored. The translation then is:

"Which wise men tell and their fathers did not conceal."¹¹

6. XVII, 7 ותכה מכעש עיני ויצרי כצל כלם

The line would be considerably improved by the presence of a verb in clause "b" parallel to ותכה. Houbigant suggested *kālim*. However, a perfect would be more natural after the imperfect consecutive ותכה. The difficulty lies in the final -m. If this be taken as the enclitic, we have the superior reading כלֹם (kālū-m). The translation then is:

"Mine eye is dimmed by reason of vexation, and all my limbs fail."

NAHUM M. SARNA.

Philadelphia.

¹⁰ For the idiom, "place devouring," cf. Exod. xv, 12; Num. xvi, 32, 34.

¹¹ I.e., litotes for, "their fathers plainly declared."

2. ON A PUZZLING PASSAGE IN THE DAMASCUS FRAGMENTS

A REPLY

In his note to my communication under that title, in this Journal VI (1955), p. 54, Dr. Teicher accuses me of ignorance of "elementary Hebrew grammar" for translating *wayyodhi'em* as "he made them known." If Dr. Teicher had but consulted Brown, Driver and Briggs' *Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 395, col. 1, lines 3-4, he would have found several instances of the Hiph'il of *yd'* with *acc. rei* and without *acc. pers.*, not to speak of the numerous cases where the *acc. pers.* is replaced by *be-*.

On p. 55, *ibid.*, Dr. Teicher states that "immediately after" the passage under discussion (ii, 12f.) the author of CDC tells us that the "men called by name" are none other than the patriarchs. Seven whole lines separate the passage in question from the mention of the patriarchs, and the passage dealing with them opens with what seems to be the formal beginning of a new diatribe; in any case its subject-matter is quite different.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

3. HEBREW *D* = "HAND"

Among the letters from Tell el-Amarna there is one, written by Biridiya of Megiddo, which is remarkable for its large number of Canaanite glosses.¹ In it occurs the following passage: "Then Zurata took him and sent him home from Hinatuna, for² Zurata had taken the money of his ransom in his hand" (lines 30-35). The words "in his hand" (*ina qāṭishu*) are glossed *ba-di-ú*. Professor N. H. Tur-Sinai³ showed that the Accadian word is in fact a clumsy adaptation of a Canaanite phrase, and that in Biblical Hebrew we find both *be-yadh* and *bedhēy* meaning "for, on account of," so that the above passage should be rendered, with better sense, "for Zurata had taken ransom money for him." As Tur-Sinai points out, *bedhēy* also means "in front of." It may therefore be

¹ Ed. KNUDTON, No. 245, pp. 792-5.

² The word-order, subject-predicate, shows that it is a circumstantial clause.

³ *Hallāshon wehassepher*, first ed. (1950), i, 372-5.

equated with *baddēy*, which, as was shown by Meyer Lambert,⁴ has in a number of passages the sense "in front of."

In Isa. xvi, 6, and Jer. xlviii, 30, we find *lō khēn baddāw* in connection with rather similar expressions about the pride of Moab. In Jer. the phrase is followed by *lō khēn 'āsū* (om. in Pesh.), an evident gloss, which exhibits also the late Hebrew tendency of construing names of peoples or countries as plurals⁵ in contrast to the singular employed in the original text of Isa. and Jer. The versions, with few exceptions,⁶ try to explain *baddāw* as a noun. I would suggest that the most natural way of taking this phrase in its context would be "untruth (lit. : non-truth⁷) is in his hands," i.e., he has quite a wrong opinion of himself. For "in his hands" meaning "he holds an opinion," or "he possesses knowledge," cf., e.g., the saying of R. Jannai in Aboth iv, 15, where *ēn be-yādhēnū* is rightly glossed by Obadiah of Bertinoro as "we do not know why."

In *ba-di-ū* the *ba* is the old form of the preposition, as in *bā-zeh*,⁸ *i* is the case-vowel, and *u* corresponds to Hebrew *-hu*,⁹ so that for "hand" we only have the consonant *d*. It has been pointed out by various scholars¹⁰ that the Egyptian sign for *d*, a picture of a hand, points to the existence of a word consisting of *d* (plus some vowel) denoting the hand, though in all forms of Egyptian known to us another word, *dj-r-t*, appears.

In Semitic we have really three forms of the word for "hand": (1) *yad*, which appears in Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic, Ugaritic, and Phœnician¹¹; owing to phonetic developments peculiar to those languages, it becomes *idu*, *iddu* in Accadian and *īdhā* in Syriac, Mandaic, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic. (2) 'd, Ethiopic *ed*, some ancient Arabic dialects *ad*,¹² some modern colloquials *īd*; this form is possibly supported by Bedauey *ay*.¹³ (3) *d*.

⁴ *REJ* 68, p. 131.

⁵ Cf. A. KROPAT, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, pp. 28-9.

⁶ See below, last paragraph.

⁷ Professor G. R. DRIVER kindly drew my attention to Accadian *lā-kināti* "falsehood."

⁸ For the various forms of the preposition, see BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss*, i, 495, supplemented by RABIN, *Ancient West-Arabian*, p. 157.

⁹ The word does not show the Canaanite elision of intervocalic *h* (cf. BIRKELAND, *Akzent und Vokalismus im Althebräischen*, pp. 34-8).

¹⁰ GARDINER, *Aegypt. Zeitschr.* 50, p. 51; id. *Egyptian Grammar*, 1st edn., p. 447; GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook*, p. 48, n. 2.

¹¹ For occurrences, see FRIEDRICH, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, pp. 240-1.

¹² Cf. RABIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 84 and 92.

¹³ COHEN, *Essai Comparatif . . . du Chamito-Sémitique*, p. 194.

The third form is no doubt the oldest; the other two arose from it through the tendency, found not only in Semitic, to shun words with too little "body." It is also possible that the word *d* was pronounced *ʿd*, with a slight vowel before it: pairs like *gīs* : *agīs* "brother-in-law," *gūdāl* : *agūdāl* "thumb" in Mishnaic Hebrew, or Arabic, etc., *bal* : Hebrew and Phœn. *abāl* "but," suggest that voiced plosives could in Semitic attract prothetic vowels also without the presence of initial consonant clusters.¹⁴ The old form was likely to survive after prepositions, and particularly in cases where the semantic connection with the hand had become obscured.

With *b-* we find the combination *bd* also in Ugaritic¹⁵ and in Phœnician *bd* "through, through the mediation of."¹⁶ In Hebrew proper we have the name *Bēdhyaḥ*, Ezra x, 35, in the Lucianic Septuagint *Badaia*, also occurring in the Samaria Ostrakon No. 58 as *bdyw*. The name means "In the hand of God" and corresponds exactly to Ugaritic *Bd'il*: it is parallel to such names as *Beḏal'ēl* "In the protection (lit.: shadow) of God," *Lā'ēl* and *Lemō'ēl* "To God."¹⁷

Already in Hebrew *baddēy* and in Accadian *iddu* we have seen that the *d* can appear geminated. It does so in certain Arabic colloquials as *yadd* or *idd*.¹⁸ This makes it possible to connect with it Hebrew *middēy* "from, since," especially since *mīdhēy* = *mi-yedhēy* occurs as an extended equivalent to *min* both in Biblical¹⁹ and Mishnaic²⁰ Hebrew. In Phœnician *md* is used like Heb. *middēy*.^{20a} In the ancient Arabic dialect of Hudhail, we learn,²¹ *matai* was used in the meaning "out of," or according to some "in": in the verses quoted it seems to mean simply "from." Since it is unlikely that such a meaning developed out of the adverb *matai* "when?" it is at least probable that we have here another occurrence of *mi-dai* = *mi-yadai*. For the phonetic alternation, compare

¹⁴ See, however, also BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, i, 216-7.

¹⁵ GORDON, *loc. cit.*

¹⁶ FRIEDRICH, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

¹⁷ Explanations for *Bedhyaḥ* include: "sprout of God" (NOTH, *Israelitische Personennamen*, p. 150), "protégé of God" (LIDZBARSKI, *Handbuch* i, 134), and "servant ('ebhedh) of God," cf. Phœn. *Bod-* as pronunciation of 'bd- in names.

¹⁸ BROCKELMANN, *op. cit.*, i, 333.

¹⁹ Ps. cxl, 5; cxli, 9; Job v, 20; possibly also Gen. xlix, 24, where it is parallel with *mishshām*, for which read *mishshem*.

²⁰ E.g., in *en sâpheq mozi' midhey waddāy* "a doubt cannot remove a matter from the status of certainty."

^{20a} Examples in HARRIS, *Grammar of the Phœnician Language*, p. 95.

²¹ RABIN, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

perhaps Accadian *itu, ittu* "side," the semantic developments of which support its origin from *idu* "hand."^{21a} In the Hudhail dialect itself we also find '*attai* "until."²² The Arab philologists equate this with common Arabic *hattai* (Classical *hattā*) and conclude that *h* could in this dialect change to '*ain*, but it appears to me at any rate more probable that it is a local development of '*adai* (Hebrew '*adhēy*), the common Semitic particle missing in Arabic.

As *mīdhēy* is substituted for *min*, so *līdhēy*, especially in Mishnaic Hebrew, replaces *le-*. In Arabic we find a corresponding form with the *d*-base, *ladai* (Classical *ladā*, colloquial *ladey*) "near, at, with," cf. Hebrew *le-yadh*, the derivation of which from "hand" was recognised by Brockelmann.²³ The antiquity of this compound preposition—which was really obsolete in post-Koranic Arabic—is also shown by the form *la-* instead of *li-*, otherwise preserved only before pronominal suffixes.

The Hebrew lexica treat *bedhēy* and *mīddēy* as derivatives of *dai*, *dēy* "enough." The recognition that these two come rather from *d* "hand" may encourage us to seek a similar origin also for *kedhē* "so that," for which some rather unsatisfactory semantic links with "sufficiency" are offered, and for its close relation, Mishnaic Hebrew *kedhāy* "fit, worthy," sometimes "able."²⁴ Since *kedhēy* so frequently simply means "to," "as far as," or "in order to" (so especially Mishnaic *kedhēy le-*, *kedhēy she-*) it might at least be argued that its second element is the same as in *līdhēy*. I would in fact like to suggest that *dai* itself is an old dual of *d* "hand," and means "power, ability," just as do *yādh* and *yādhayim*.²⁵ Indeed, *u-pho'olkhā ēn yādhayim lō* (Isa. xlv, 9) could practically be translated by Mishnaic *u-pho'olkhā ēnō kedhāy* "your work is no good." Also in the simile of the thieves, Jer. xlix, 9, Ob. i, 5, it makes better sense to translate "they steal as much as they can" rather than "they steal sufficient for themselves."

As is well known, *dai* has no etymology in the cognate languages, and Barth²⁶ felt constrained to suggest that *kedhēy* and Syriac *kaddū* "enough" were the original forms and *dai* erro-

21a Cf. also the *t* in '*kty*, note 27.

22 RABIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-5.

23 *Op. cit.*, ii, 383, following C. DE LANDBERG, *Dathina*, p. 426 *seq.*

24 E.g., Mishnah *Sotah* i, 4; B.T. *Yoma* 87b in the prayer of R. HAMNUNA.

25 Cf. *B.D.B.*, p. 390a.

26 It might be worth considering to connect it with Minæan *k-* "to, for" and Amharic *ka-* "from, by."

neously reconstituted through identifying the first root-element with the preposition *ke-*. The suggestion here offered provides an etymological background, though it does not fully account for the meaning of the *ke-*.²⁷ Syriac *kaddū* would also be easiest to explain as an old **ka-ddi-hu*, with a possessive pronoun added and absorbed before it had yet lost its vocalic element.

It is interesting to note that some versions translate the above-mentioned *baddāw* in such a way as to suggest that they read it *kedhāw* or the like. Thus in Isa. xvi, 6, the Targum has *lā shāwē lehōn* "it is not worth their while," and Saadiah *laisa dhālika min qadrihi* "that is not in his power"; in Jer. xlviii, 30, the Vulgate has *et quod non sit juxta eam virtus eius*.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

²⁷ It seems that this *kaddū* must be kept distinct from Jewish and Christian Palestinian Aramaic *kedhū(n)* "now, still, yet," which corresponds to Mandæan *akandit*, Babylonian Jewish Aramaic *'kty* (traditionally pronounced *akkattī*), where the prefixed *a-* represents *'al* (cf. NÖLDEKE, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 202). The Babylonian Aramaic form corresponds closely to *'kdy*, "until now," in the early Arabic inscription in Nabatæan script at an-Namāra (text in CANTINEAU, *Le Nabatéen* ii, 49). I would suggest that the *d* in these words is cognate with Bibl. Aram. *edhayin*, Arabic *idh*, *idhin* (in *yauma'idhin*, etc.), Hebrew *āz*, and is perhaps a primitive noun **dh* "time."

CURRENT LITERATURE

G. BEER. *Hebräische Grammatik*, revised by R. Meyer. *Sammlung Götschen*, Nos. 763-764a. Pocket size, 2 parts: I (1952) 157 pp., II (1955) 195 pp. Price 17/6.

This is not, as one would expect from its size, a general outline sketch of the language for the non-Hebraist (still a desideratum), but a full-scale grammar of Biblical Hebrew, concentrating, however, on the normal aspects of that language rather than on the exceptions and irregularities. It is too compressed to serve the needs of the beginner, but would seem admirable for revision after a year or two of study.

Its novel feature—due entirely to Professor Meyer of Jena—is the historical approach. In each section the description starts with "Old Canaanite," takes into account Phoenician, Moabite, etc., and treats of the forms preserved by the Dead Sea Scrolls (this means in practice the Isaiah Scroll A), the Hexaplaric transliterations, the Samaritan tradition, and the Palestinian and the Babylonian vocalisations, in addition to the standard Tiberian forms of our Bibles. This provides an instructive background to the standard forms, enabling the learner to see the language "in depth."

The value of this innovation is not seriously diminished by some faults in its execution, and these are pointed out here merely in the hope that they will be put right in a future edition. For the pre-Hebrew stage it might have been better to restrict oneself to the little we know from the Tell-Amarna letters rather than draw to such an extent upon Ugaritic, upon whose close relation to Hebrew scholars are by no means agreed. Indeed, seeing the forms of Ugaritic and Hebrew in such close proximity in this book has convinced the present reviewer that they are not particularly closely related. Also it is misleading to provide the Ugaritic forms with

vowels. Meyer often seems rather rash in his evaluation of the Dead Sea material.

In spite of its small compass, the book gives a fair-sized chapter on syntax, embodying some good observations.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

MIDRASHIC SELECTIONS. Introduction and Notes by P. R. WEIS. *Semitic Study Series*, N.S. II. XVIII, 53 pp. Published by E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1955. Price 5.20 guilders.*

The *Semitic Study Series* is well known to all students of Semitic languages; in the Hebrew field, Lévi's *Ecclesiasticus* and Krauss's *Sanhedrin* have done sterling service. The present volume preserves the tradition of clear printing and ample aid to the student.

The title is a little misleading, since what is presented is not an anthology, but chapters (*parashiyoth*) xlix-lx of *Bereshith Rabba*, with all non-exegetical matter omitted. Likely to mislead is also the statement in the *Preface* that the text printed is that of Brit. Mus. MS. Add. 27169 "corrected, where necessary, according to the critical edition by J. Theodor." The MS. in question is the one on which Theodor based his edition and from which he departed only where it was obviously wrong, so that the text here presented is in fact precisely that of Theodor. There is, of course, nothing wrong with that: Theodor's edition is expensive and hard to find, and the ordinary prints of *Ber. Rabba* are very poor indeed, so that the student is well served by having a good text at this price—though it might have been even better to base the text of the Selections on the Vatican MS., the superiority of which was pointed out already by Albeck.

The part of the text printed "is

confined to the passages concerned directly with the interpretation of the text" of the Bible. Not only narrative and discursive passages are omitted, but "alternative interpretations are retained only when they involve different hermeneutical principles." These restrictions mean that the student gets not the midrash as a literary work, nor those passages most likely to introduce him to the spirit of the period, but an introduction to Rabbinic hermeneutics. This approach is underlined by the annotation. Each interpretation gets two footnotes, one referring to a classification of the difficulties which the rabbis found in the text, the other referring to a similar classification of "solutions." The two classifications are set out in the Introduction, each item followed by a list of the instances found in the Selections. Dr. Weis has in this way provided a valuable tool for the study of early Rabbinic exegesis, especially as in the classification of "solutions" he also provides, where necessary, brief pointers to the understanding of the interpretation. The usefulness of this guide to the undergraduate student is somewhat marred by excessive condensation and the use of unexplained technical terms. Its use requires an effort, but the reader who persists is sure to find it worth while.

Yet, while admiring Dr. Weis's thoroughness and ingenuity, one cannot suppress a feeling that this concentration on the hermeneutical aspect may frighten any but the most determined student off the study of midrash literature. It is surely significant that so many anthologists of Midrash, in Israel and elsewhere, have given prominence to the non-exegetical, narrative elements. As part of a more extensive course on Midrash, however, this reader will provide a welcome means for acquiring the intellectual discipline needed for further research.

C. RABIN.

BARUCH KURZWEIL, *מסכת הרומאן*
(A Treatise on the Novel). 404
pp. Published by Schocken,
Jerusalem, 1953.

Dr. Kurzweil, one of Israel's leading critics and historians of literature, gives us here some of his most mature and penetrating studies. A little over half of the volume, "Chapters in the History of the European Novel," lies necessarily outside the purview of this journal, though it may be mentioned that original research of this kind of non-Hebrew literatures is something of an innovation in Hebrew writing. We shall deal here only with the 173 pages devoted to the writings of S. J. Agnon.

"Here, in Israel and in the Hebrew language, one of the most significant developments in the evolution of modern narrative art is taking shape [p. 160]. For over ten years now Agnon's epic work has been leaving behind all the tried and accepted ways of the artistic perception and representation of reality. Out of its own inwardness, by extending and developing the possibilities hidden within it since its first beginnings, Agnon's art moves towards a revolutionary change in the essential form of the story and novel [p. 154]." As is well known, Agnon's fascination for the general reader lay in his evocation of the atmosphere of the Galician small town and the Old Yishuv, in his kindly, subtle humour, and in the brilliant yet somehow nostalgic style incorporating the very spirit of the Aggada. These effectively masked the strong surrealist and depth-psychological element in these stories, which places him in a line with Kafka, Joyce, and H. Broch. His *Sefer ha-Ma'asim*, published at the beginning of the Second World War, came as a shock to his public, for there the realist form was dropped and Agnon emerged as the great revealer of the subconscious.

Kurzweil was the first, and has

Oxford.

remained the greatest, interpreter of the "new" Agnon. He shows step by step, in closely reasoned analysis of the plot and the symbolism of the stories, the inner evolution of the psychological approach in his work, and incidentally offers a profound interpretation of the perplexities of humanity, and in particular Jewry, in our own times. Much of the book, in spite of its rather difficult style, reads like a thriller. It is a "must" for everyone who wants to understand Agnon.

Though the book unfortunately lacks an index, it is printed with the usual excellence of the Schocken Publishing House, who are also the publishers of Agnon's works.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

M. GOTTSTEIN, Z. LIVNEH, S. SPAHN, **הדקדוק העברי השמושי** (Practical Hebrew Grammar) XII, 168, xiv pp. Published by Schocken, Jerusalem. 1954. Price: If2.800.

This is a grammar for the use of secondary schools in Israel. As such it is a considerable improvement on the works hitherto available. The rules are often better formulated, the phenomena of the present-day language receive more attention, and much deadwood of exceptions and archaic forms has been cut out. Well-designed exercises follow each chapter, and extensive lists of verbs and nouns provide the teacher with material for practice drill without the need of searching his mind or the lexicon, and at the same time give a rough idea of the importance of individual inflection-schemes within the language. Much thought has been given to layout and to visual presentation of facts. A special appendix deals with "pointing." Syntax is only treated incidentally, though some useful hints are given.

The problems of the practical Hebrew grammarian in Israel are two-fold: hitherto, Hebrew was invariably taught as a foreign

language, with the stress on Biblical Hebrew; now it has to be presented to young people whose mother-tongue it is, and the main stress has to be laid upon the practical current usage. In both respects the present work marks an advance, though in neither it can be said to have traversed the whole way. Perhaps the authors are right in being cautious: a school text-book should not be too revolutionary, otherwise the pupils become strangers to the existing intellectual tradition. As for the current written language, the basic research is as yet completely lacking. Still, the learner in Israel should be told, e.g., that today the 1st sing. pl. past of verbs ending in *n* is mostly spelt with two *nuns* (נתננו), or that the suffix *-it* frequently forms adverbs. There is a certain *malaise* about references to modern usage in this book, characteristic for the whole approach to these matters in Israel. Nevertheless, this grammar offers much interesting guidance with regard to current linguistic standards, and will repay careful study by anyone interested in the development of the language.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

A MINORITY IN BRITAIN. *Social Studies of the Anglo-Jewish Community*. Edited by Maurice Freedman. Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. Ltd. 21s.

There is a large literature on the history of the Anglo-Jewish community, but until Mr. Lipman's *Social History, 1850 to 1950*, published last year, save in terms of articles, not easily accessible, there is little or nothing which deals with its sociological structure. For this reason the book under review is valuable as indicating a new approach to a facet of absorbing interest.

This is a book by experts in a variety of fields. It is both a review of the past and an assessment of trends, developments, and needs.

The volume does not pretend to be exhaustive. It suggests that it may do its duty by provoking a scientific and detailed study of Anglo-Jewish social, religious, and commercial life.

An introduction by the editor indicates the possible scope of future studies. He refers, *inter alia*, to the field of assimilation, often termed "group relations"; the possibility of comprehensive studies of local communities and their co-relation to the general trends of social processes at work; the co-ordination of Anglo-Jewry; and antisemitism.

Dr. James Parkes contributes a distinguished essay on the history of the Anglo-Jewish community, which by its breadth and avoidance of encumbering details, gives a vivid picture of 300 years. Some of his headings will indicate its scope—the nature of the Jewish people, the first Jewish community and its re-establishment, the synagogue structure, the Sephardim, the Ashkenazim, the United Synagogue, and the Chief Rabbinate, other Orthodox religious bodies, the movement for Reform and Progressive Judaism, secular institutions, the status of the community and non-Jewish reactions.

Then comes a most detailed paper by Dr. Hannah Neustatter on "Demographic and other Statistical Aspects of Anglo-Jewry"; the statistics given by her are of absorbing interest. She draws attention to the uncertainty and paucity of the basic facts and draws the conclusion that the Jewish birth-rate, the average size of the family, and reproduction rate would all seem to be lower than those of the population as a whole. The proportion of older people is seemingly larger also in the Jewish community. She adds that there is no longer any ground for the assumption that Jews will overwhelmingly marry within the community and that therefore, numerically, Anglo-Jewry is on the decline. Further, her view is that religious ties have much weakened and that their place has not been

taken by any alternative binding influence. Anglo-Jewry, she concludes, has more and more become a middle-class group, culturally assimilated to the nation, but retaining certain characteristics, notably family organisation, emphasis on education, and occupational structure.

Dr. Brotz writes on the outlines of Jewish society in London and indicates that his study is primarily an attempt to analyse the ways in which Jews in England rank one another socially. Much of his work was done by means of personal interview, the result of which is necessarily conditioned by his own reactions. He finds that those who represent the community are expected to follow the best standards of behaviour in the non-Jewish world; that there has been a rise of the "protest" leader and of institutions to combat anti-Jewish feeling and the rise of institutions of purely social significance as contrasted with ritual institutions. He concludes, however, that the synagogue and its related educational institutions still are, and must continue to be, the central institutions of the community. The editor writes on "Jews in the Society of Britain." This in effect is an intensive and closely knit study of Jews as a minority. It deals with Jews and economic life, prejudice and its forms, the processes of assimilation, and the impact of Zionism.

The book has a series of useful appendices. Tables of most significant and absorbing sociological interest are contributed by Dr. Neustatter. There is a valuable list of works cited. Finally, there is happily an adequate index.

The contributors are to be congratulated on a fascinating and informing series of studies which it is to be hoped have blazed the trail for others of the same genre. No one who functions within the religious, educational, or social mechanism can afford to be without this book which repays the closest study. It is not necessary to accept its theses. But it is vital

to the continued health of the Anglo-Jewish community that we should know more about it, both quantitatively and qualitatively. We owe a large debt to the essayists for their work.

It is desirable to add a word of thanks and congratulation to the publishers, both on the format of the production and for their public spirit in undertaking its publication.

NEVILLE LASKI.

FESTSCHRIFT ALBRECHT ALT (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx-Universität, Leipzig, Gesellschafts- u. Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, iii, 1953-4). Pp. 178.

It is in the nature of *Festschriften* that they range over wide and diverse fields and even a reviewer with the most catholic taste must find their contents of unequal interest. Most of the eighteen contributions in this volume are devoted, as is only fitting, to O.T. studies. Rudolf Meyer's essay on the "Significance of Linear Vocalisation for the History of Hebrew" ranges from Ugaritic to Qumrân texts. Siegfried Herrmann writes on the "Königsnovelle" in Egypt and Israel, A. Jepsen on the *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten*, whilst W. Herrmann, in a note on *Qoheleth* iii, 14, compares this verse with the well-known Ptahhotep formula. The *Formgeschichte* of the Ahiiram inscription is discussed by H. Donner, and *formgeschichtliche* studies in the Book of Job are presented by Johannes Herz. The volume opens with E. Lauch on the *Cod. Sinaiticus* and ends with an article by F. Maass on the definition of ecstasy—an article that says nothing that is either new or startling. Lindblom's important contributions to the problem are not even mentioned in the notes. S. Morenz argues persuasively that Anubis *kleidouchos* (on a Berlin sarcophagus) borrowed his key from

Aiakos. Hans Bardtke translates large extracts of the Tractate *Sopherim* but makes no contribution to the study of its textual or other problems. J. Leipoldt discusses primitive Christian baptism and summarises the Jewish and pagan elements that went into the formation of the rite. It is surprising that Leipoldt (who is also the editor of the Coptic text of Hippolytus's Constitutions) finds nothing to say on the wealth of Jewish material in Hippolytus's baptismal order. Carl Steuernagel examines the original function of the Lord's Prayer and suggests that it was a "short prayer" composed by Jesus for his disciples on the pattern of the conventional short prayers of the synagogue, of which *habhinenu* is the standard example. The remaining essays are of more theological and philosophical interest. Here, mention can only be made of two articles by Emil Fuchs on "Karl Marx and Christianity" and "Socially Conditioned Dangers to Lutheranism." Fuchs (the father of the well-known physicist) is the rare example of a Christian who completely succumbs to the religiously experienced social challenge of Marxism. Unlike the rest of his brethren (with the exception of Karl Barth), Fuchs was apparently unable to equate religion with the interests of Western capitalist society. His contribution is a rather confused but moving testimony. Z.W.

CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG. *The Essenes and The Kabbalah*. (Two essays by C. D. Ginsburg). Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955. Pp. 245. Price: 12s. 6d.

Two well-known essays by C. D. Ginsburg, originally published in 1864 and 1863 respectively, are now reprinted in one small volume. The purpose of this new edition is not quite clear, for although the two essays are well written and informative as far as they go, they can hardly be held to be up to

date. Their interest is thus mainly historical and, in fact, both essays contain a concise history of the study of their respective subjects. The former essay, after quoting all the relevant texts from Philo, Pliny the Elder, Josephus, Solinus Polyhistor, Porphyry, etc., summarises the theories on the Essene problem from de Rossi to Graetz. Similarly, *The Kabbalah* ends with a précis of the views of Franck, Joel, Landauer, Jellinek, and Graetz.

There is little point in criticising this work in detail. Today we may have to think again about the Essenes and their possible connections with Pythagoreanism (denied by G. p. 16) in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but in 1864 these were still peacefully resting in their caves. The derivation of *zerizim* from the "apron" (*zaraz*) that was given to members of the order seems more ingenuous than probable. The kabbalistic account is obviously defective in many essentials. Though there are few positively false statements (according to the state of scholarship in the nineteenth century), there is utter lack of grasp of the essential meaning of the symbols under discussion; cf. the poor account of the "kings that died" (p. 103), the oversimplified cosmogony (p. 105), and the failure to understand the dramatic nature of the all-important relation between *kudsa' berikh hu'* and his *Sekhinah* (p. 122). The *Bahir* is conspicuously absent from the survey of kabbalistic literature and the translations from the *Zohar* are very inaccurate paraphrases. **נחש** never means the "Beast" in the Kabbalah, but the "Serpent." The treatise *de auditu kabbalistico* is not by Raymundus Lullus and it is misleading to credit Knorr v. Rosenroth with a Latin translation of Gikatilia's *Saarey 'Orah*. There are a few misprints such as Aleavez for Alkavez (p. 214), Rittengal for Rittangel (p. 143). The *Zohar* reference on p. 96 must be ii, 42b and not i, 42b.

Z.W.

MARGARET A. MURRAY: *The Divine King in England*. Faber & Faber. Pp. 279. Price: 25s.

It is good to be reminded that Divine Kingship is a problem that agitates not only students of Near Eastern religion and myth-ritual fans. In her latest book Dr. Murray continues her former studies on witch-cult in Europe by applying her theories to English history and attempting to show that the ancient fertility religion, the "Dianic Cult," surviving as it did under a veneer of Christianity and crystallised in the dogma of the King as Incarnate God, was in fact, practised in this country till late after the reformation. The King is the divine Giver of Life and on his health and potency depends the welfare of the land. This much is known to all readers of Frazer. But Dr. Murray's "pattern" goes further. The Divine King must be sacrificed, either himself or vicariously, so that the Life-Spirit can depart from him and enter a more vigorous body (*viz.*, the magically reinvigorated king). This takes place at regular intervals—seven years or multiples of seven—and at the traditional sacrificial months.

With this hypothesis Miss Murray seeks to explain a certain number of odd features that tend to baffle the student of English history. It accounts for the extraordinary high "mortality rate" among medieval crowned persons (divine victims) and of highly placed members of their family or immediate surroundings (substitute victims). In due course these rites were camouflaged as trials for high treason. Anne Boleyn, Katherine Howard, Essex, etc., were all substitute victims, chosen not necessarily by the king but by certain sinister committees or "covens." The spectacular cruelty of executions (disembowelling, etc.) is obviously connected with their fertility character. Much of what Miss Murray has to say on Coronation ritual, royal divine titles,

etc., is highly suggestive, but her over-all contention is far from convincing. The murders and killings as well as the victims' strange "acquiescence" can easily be explained in a different way, and the dates do not always seem to fit the required pattern. And why did so many kings fall in battle against Penda, whilst Penda himself continued to flourish to his eightieth year? Z.W.

J. W. DOEVE. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Van Gorcum-Assen, 1954. Pp. 232. Price: Fl. 11.50.

Dr. Doeve, a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church and sometime lecturer in N.T. criticism at Leiden University, claims that insufficient attention has been paid by N.T. scholars to rabbinic Judaism and more particularly to the study of rabbinic hermeneutics. Chapters 1-2 give an interesting and most valuable historic survey of the use of rabbinic material from Lightfoot to Billerbeck. The author's assessment of the attitude of N.T. scholars in the modern period is both illuminating and saddening: with a fairness and honesty that are in the best tradition of Dutch scholarship he makes it clear how prejudice, apologetic interest, and religious *parti pris* continually interfere with, or even pervert, scholarly judgment. Theology still is a militant science, and Dr. Doeve illustrates this with reference to Goppelt and Rengstorf (pp. 28 and 91f.). Moreover, "for many Western scholars it is a typical habit of mind to distrust any scientific work done by a rabbi" (p. 44). One might equally well add that many Jewish scholars, soaked as they are with rabbinics, tend to show contempt for the inevitably lesser familiarity of Gentiles with the vast material.

Perhaps Dr. Doeve is flogging dead horses, because the relevance of rabbinics to N.T. studies seems to be fairly well appreciated, at

any rate in this country. At the same time he really breaks new ground by concerning himself less with Aramaic originals or with rabbinic parallels of the Strack-Billerbeck kind, and concentrating more on the possible relevance of the rabbinic method or technique of scriptural interpretation. Discussing 2 Cor. iii, Dr. Doeve points out that when Paul rejects the midrash of the synagogue, he rejects their results and not their hermeneutics, which he applies for his own purposes. That the same technique of midrash applied to one and the same verse can lead to widely divergent results is illustrated by Talmudic material as well as by Paul's and James's opposing exegesis of Gen. xv, 6 (Rom. iv, 3; Gal. iii, 6; James ii, 14f.). The Gospels themselves are alleged to show traces of early Christian midrash which we must reconstruct if we want to solve certain exegetical puzzles. Chapter 3 gives an outline of early Tannaitic exegesis, based on the known standard works and without attempting to contribute anything new to the subject.

It is obvious that Dr. Doeve's hypothesis, if it can be substantiated, should prove a very fruitful one. Its basic assumption is that the O.T. must have been a major element in the life of early Christians. Rejecting the *testimonia* or proof-texts hypothesis (associated here mainly with the name of Rendel Harris) Dr. Doeve asserts that isolated verses would never have compelled conviction; it was the total context of a quotation that counted. On this point reference could have been made to C. H. Dodd's *According to the Scriptures* (1952), but perhaps this work was published too late for Dr. Doeve to avail himself of it. The author puts forward the alternative hypothesis that the early Christian study of the O.T. resulted in a Christian midrash.

All this sounds very promising, but reflections on general approach and methodology are only worth as much as the number of details

which they illuminate. Dr. Doeve has chosen a number of the thorniest and most complicated N.T. passages to test his theory and the result is that he leaves his readers far from convinced. This holds true particularly of his discussion of the kingdom of God—Son of Man relation. It is, indeed, a remarkable feature of the Gospels that the Kingdom is not related to the title of Messiah but to that of Son of Man. Dr. Doeve postulates a kind of focal midrash on Dan. vii, 13-14, which he then finds to radiate in all directions and to shed light on a large number of passages. In combination with other scriptural verses it provides new midrashim, explaining still more passages. From a *formgeschichtliche* point of view it is suggested that the hermeneutic activity of the early Christians is the actual *Sitz im Leben* of at least some minor complexes of traditional material.

Whenever the author's suggestions are simpler and more convincing, they turn out to be instances not of alleged midrash but simply of Aramaic, viz., Jewish background; cf. Acts ii, 24, *krateisthai* and *lysai* and the ambiguity of (Ps. cxvi, 3) **חבלי מות** (p. 170). On the other hand it seems unnecessary to interpret Hagar (Gal. iv, 25a) as due to assonance with **ההר**, although this procedure might be sanctioned by midrashic licence. But Mount Sinai is in "Arabia," and can therefore be symbolised by Hagar, Ishmael's mother. The identity of Zion and Sinai, as also the translation of Mount Zion to the wilderness for the occasion of the giving of the Law, is known in midrashic literature. Concerning Paul's use of *epistrepsei* to render **בבא** (II Cor. iii, 16; cf. Ex. xxxvi, 34), Dr. Doeve could have adduced in support of his argument (p. 99) the Sifra on Lev. xiv, 44: **זוהיא בראה**

זו היא שיבה. As the author refers (p. 62) to R. Akiba's method of exegesis and its ironical rejection by his colleagues, he might have added the example from b. Sanh. 67b to the effect that one frog only covered the whole of Egypt (cf. Ex. viii, 2). For this midrash offers the most complete analogy to Paul's argument Gal. iii, 16.

I Cor. x, 4 obviously echoes the Jewish aggadah of the well following Israel through the wilderness. Paul's addition, however, "and the rock was Christ" is no midrash at all but an instance of hellenistic allegorising. Jesus' own midrash Mt. xxii, 32f. concerning the resurrection of the dead (p. 106) can be explained quite simply. Since "God is not the God of the dead but of the living," the words "I am the God of Abraham" etc. must be construed as meaning "I still am the God of the living Abraham." Dr. Doeve is right in pointing out that this is rather proof of eternal life than of the resurrection of the body. For this very reason rabbinic Judaism uses midrashim based on other, more "conclusive" texts.

The English is somewhat heavy-going on occasion (p. 177 acceptance for acceptance). There is a misprint in the Hebrew on p. 167 and the reference to Ber. Rabbah, p. 86, n. 3 should be to lxxxvi, 19 and not to lxxxiv. The vb. **שבת** (p. 105, n. 1) should be translated "spend the Sabbath" and not "keep Sabbath."

The author himself makes no exaggerated claims for his approach which he merely wants to see admitted as a working hypothesis alongside other methods of N.T. scholarship. Perhaps one could wish that he continue his line of inquiry by applying his method, for the time being, to passages less intricate and complex than the ones chosen in this volume.

Z.W.

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY LECTURES

Among recent public lectures given under the auspices of the Society for Jewish Study have been the following:

Rabbi Dr. I. Maybaum: "Messianic Philosophy—An Appreciation of the Work of Franz Rosenzweig" (on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his death).

Dr. Helen Rosenau, Lecturer in the History of Art, University of Manchester: "Contributions to Jewish Iconography."

Dr. M. Braun: "Josephus as Historian."

Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck, President and Principal of the Society for Jewish Study: "Epochs in Jewish History."

Dr. J. L. Teicher, Lecturer in Rabbinics in the University of Cambridge: "New Light on the Excommunication of Spinoza."

Dr. J. Weingreen, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Dublin: "Themes in Biblical Stories."

Rabbi K. Kahana, Lecturer in Codes, Jews' College, London: "The Modern Approach to the Study of Jewish Civil Law."

Dr. Erwin Rosenthal, Lecturer in Hebrew in the University of Cambridge: "The Bible in Israel Today."

Rabbi Dr. Samuel Cohon, Professor of Theology at the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati: "Judaism: A Study in Semantics."

HUGH HARRIS, *Hon. Secretary.*

Hillel House, London, W.C.1.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford 7, Lancs.

SESSION 1955/56 WINTER TERM

1. POST-GRADUATE RESEARCH SEMINARS. Every Monday, 2—4 p.m.

The following Papers will be read:

October 17: Mr. J. G. WEISS, M.A., "Studies in Early Hasidism."

October 24: Dr. S. M. STERN, "Neoplatonism—From the end of antiquity to Islamic and Jewish Philosophy."

October 31: Rabbi Dr. A. ALTMANN, M.A., "Isaac Israeli's Metaphysical Doctrine."

November 7: Mr. R. LOEWE, M.A., "Rabbinic and Ecclesiastical Bible Exegesis: Controversy or Dialogue?"

November 14: Dr. R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY, "The Doctrine of the Sefirot in the *Maggid Mesharim*."

November 21: Rabbi Dr. L. JACOBS, B.A., "R. Shneur Zalman's Doctrine of *Tsimtsum*."

November 28: Mr. HAROLD FISCH, M.A., "The Biblical Doctrine of Covenant."

December 5: Mr. A. RUBINSTEIN, LL.M., "The Theological Significance of some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll."

2. TUTORIALS FOR POST-GRADUATE AND ADVANCED STUDENTS

Every Monday and Tuesday, 11 a.m.—1 p.m.

Rabbi Dr. A. ALTMANN: Introduction to Jewish Philosophy. Reading of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*.

Mr. J. G. WEISS, M.A.: Introduction to Habad Hasidism, and Reading of the *Tanya*. Reading of the *Zohar*.

Dr. R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY: Introduction to the halakic and hagadic Midrashim. Reading of the *Midrash Rabba*.

Mr. A. RUBINSTEIN, LL.M.: Reading of texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls.